

A

(3)

REPLY, TO AN  
ANSVVERE. MADE  
BY A POISH ADVERSARIE, TO  
the two Chapters in the first part of that Booke,  
which is intituled *a Friendly Ad-vertisement*  
to the pretended Catholickes in  
*Ireland.*

WHEREIN,

Those two points; concerning his Maje-  
sties SUPREMACIE, and the RELIGION,  
established by the *Laws* and *Statutes* of the  
Kingdome, be further justified and de-  
fended against the vaine cavils  
and exceptions of that  
Adversarie:

By CHRISTOPHER SIETHORP, Knight, one  
of His Majesties Iustices of His Court of Chiefe  
Place within the same Realme.

PROVER. 24. 21.

*Feare the Lord, & the King: & meddle not with them that are seditions.*

DUBLIN,

Printed by the Societie of STATIONERS

*Anno Domini. 1625.*

*1. d. 231.*

*This Aut. j. Name is put in Lower of water  
of course the book*

THE  
OF  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE

THE  
THE  
THE  
THE





TO THE RIGHT  
HONORABLE, MY V  
RIE GOOD LORD, HENRY,  
LORD VISCOVNT FAULK-  
LAND, LORD DEPV  
TIE  
of Ireland.



At the divulging of my former Booke, ( Right Honorable ), there were many great and vaunting speeches uttered by the pretended Catholickes, as if forthwith, or at least, very speedily, it should have beene fully and sufficiently answered. And indeede within a while after, came forth an answer, not to the whole Booke, but onely to a part thereof; namely, to the ~~first~~ two Chapters contayned in the first part of it, made by one that calleth himselfe *Iohn at Stile*: who knowing (as it seemeth), the weakenesse of his owne an-

---

## *The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

---

swere, therein promised, a better and further answer, that should then shortly come forth to the whole Booke: which should be so substantially done, as that it should be futeable and correspondent to the three Conditions required by me. This maner of answer, to the whole booke, promised so long since, is the thing that I have all this while expected; & in expectation whereof, I have hitherto deferred to publish a Reply to any other answer. But having now thus long expected it in vaine, & not knowing when it wil appeare, or whether ever, or never: I thinke it not amisse, in the interim, to reply to that answer, which marcheth and masketh under the name of *Iohn at Stile*, as having no other, nor better, as yet, to reply unto. Where, first of all, it were fit to learne, what this mans right and proper name is. But because hee is so loth to declare it, I care not much to know it; for it is not somuch the man, as the matter he delivereth, that I regarde. Howbeit, for his owne credite, and the credite of his cause, ( if any credite had belonged unto it ), it had beene much better for him to have put no name at all unto that his worke, then a wrong, false, and counterfeit name, as hee hath done. For, if in the verie first entrance, hee thus  
mis.

---

## The Epistle Dedicatorie.

---

misdeameaneth himselfe, and feareth not to utter  
so great an untruth : What good dealing, or sin-  
cere truth, may we expect from him, in the resi-  
due of his discourse? Wherein also, whilst hee  
strived to make more hast then good speede, hee  
hath shewed himselfe to bee, like *canis festinans,*  
*cacos edens catulos.* For, howsoever he thrusteth  
himselfe forward, and will needs take upon him,  
to be *Iohannes ad oppositum* : yet he speaketh very  
little, or nothing *ad propositum.* Insomuch, that  
sundry, by reason of the futilitie and frivolousnes  
of that his answer, have thought it not worthy  
or meete to bee replied unto. Neverthelesse, be-  
cause all be not of that understanding and judge-  
ment, as to bee able to discerne the frivolousnes  
and weakenesse of it: and that the pretended Ca-  
tholickes, doe, for their parts, so highly esteeme,  
approve, and applaude it, (for *Regnat inter cacos*  
*Luscus*) : and for that I am also, therein, so parti-  
cularly touched and taxed : but chiefly and espe-  
cially, for that Gods Religion, and his Majesties  
Supremacie, (which two things ought ever to be  
most deare unto us all,) be there purposely and  
professedly encountred and oppugned : I could  
doe no lesse, in good dutie, and for all these re-  
spects, but make and publish this my Reply unto  
it:

## The Epistle Dedicatorie.

it: for the further confirmation of the Protestants in those two maine and most weightie points: & for the further confutation also, & conviction of the Papists, & making them yet more and more inexcusable, if after so cleare & abundant evidence of truth, (and consequently against all good Conscience,) they will still bee wilfull, stubborne, and unreformed herein: which yet I trust they will not be. For, they know, that *durum est contra stimulos calcitrare*: and that there is no hope, that ever they shall or can prevaile, that be *ἡμιμαχοί*, that is, *Fighters* and *Contenders* against God, and his Religion, or any of his Sacred and Divine Ordinances. Yea, in such a case, what is fitter, then *duro nodo, durus cuneus*? And so sayth *Tertullian*, that *duritia vincenda est, non suadenda*; and this rule S. *Augustine* also giveth & teacheth, that, men in error, are first to be taught, admonished and instructed; but if after all this, they will notwithstanding (without any ground of sufficient reason), be and continue perverse and obstinate, then must terror, punishment, and co-active Lawes, be put in execution, for the reclaying of them. For, *Qui Phreneticum ligat & Lethargicū excitat, ambobus molestus, ambos amat*, saith the same S. *Augustine*. But of this point concerning

*Act. 9. 5.*

*Act. 5. 39.*

*Proverb. 21. 30.*

*Tertul. lib. com.*

*Gnostie. cap. 21.*

*Aug. Epist. 48.*

*& Epist. 204.*

---

## *The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

---

ning the authoritie of the Regall & Civill sword, and power coactive, to be extended against refractary and contemptuous offenders, ( aswell in matters Ecclesiasticall, and touching Religion, as in matters temporall, and concerning the Common-wealth ), more is spoken in my former Booke, and in this also afterward, upon occasion given by mine Adversarie : and therefore I shall not neede, heere to speake any further of it, especially to your Lordshippe, whose wisedome can, and doth easily perceive, not onely how lawfull, but how expedient, requisite, and necessary also it is, to be extended and used in his due time and place. These things, ( Right Honorable ), I am humbly bould to Dedicate unto your Lordshippe: Both, because unto you it is, that under his most Excellent Majestie, the chiefe care of matters concerning the good of this Kingdome, doth appertayne: And because also, such is knowne to be your noble and pious disposition, as that a worke of this sorte, you are ever most readie and willing to accept and patronize. God ( if it be his will ) convert the Papists of this Kingdome from their errors, to his truth : and preserve your Lordshippe to his glorie, the good of his Church, the benefit of this Common-



## *The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

weale, and to the increase of your owne honor  
in this life, and to your everlasting happinesse  
in the life to come, through I E S U S  
CHRIST. Amen.

Your Lordshippes humble

at Commandement,

*Christopher Sibthorp.*





# TO THE Reader.



*Doubt not, ( courteous Reader ) but you well remember, that, in the conclusion of my former Booke, I desired of him that would make Answer thereunto, these three things: First, that he would answer it, not by parts or peece-meales, but wholly and intirely, from the beginning of it, to the end. Secondly, that he would doe it, not superficially and sophistically, but substantially, soundly, and satisfactorily, if he could. Thirly, I desired him to doe it, as in love and Charitie, so also with an affection, onely to follow Gods truth; and withall to set his name unto it, as I had done to that Booke of mine. But none of these requests hath this Answerer beene pleased to performe towards me. For, touching the first: he is so farre from answering the whole Booke, from the beginning of it to the end, that he hath endeavoured to answer onely two Chapters thereof, namely the two Chapters, contayned in the first part of it, and no more. And whereas secondly I desired, a sound, sufficient, and satisfactory Answer to be made; he hath answered even to those two Chapters, ( which himselfe selected to make answer unto, ) very sleightly, slenderly and superficially, and in nosorte substantially, soundly and satisfactorily, as shall afterwards appeare. And touching my third request, which consisteth of diverse branches, let any man judge, that hath seene*

## To the Reader.

and read his *Answer*, whether it bee made, (as I desired), in a good, loving and Charitable manner, which would best have becomed him : or, in a scoffing and deriding fashion, in sundrie places thereof, which doth no way become him : as also whether hee hath done it, with this affection, onely to follow Gods truth, or with an affection rather, to follow and advance mans errors and Constitutions, against a manifest divine truth : and lastly, what reason he had, not onely, not to set his owne right and true name unto it, but in steede thereof, to set a false, fictitious and counterfeit name, calling himselfe, Iohn at Stile. What? Is he ashamed of his owne right name? Or doe any use to get credite by putting a wrong name to their worke? But this is indeede, *Dignum patella operculum* : a false and counterfeite name, being fittest, & most suteable to a false and counterfeite cause, which is the thing he maintaineth.

Howbeit, as one desirous to excuse himselfe herein, he saith, that my requiring of the *Answerer* to put his name unto the *Answer*, is in effect as much, as to debarre any man from answering unto it: because of the Statute of 2. Elizabeth, which doth, (saith he) bind mens tongues and penne within this Kingdome, with the corde of a *Præmunire* from oppugning the Supremacie, cyther by word or writing. Whereunto I reply, that he that in answering is required to put his name to his answer, is so farre from being debarred from answering, that cleane contrariwise, hee is thereby permitted to answer, (if hee please) so as he put his name thereunto. Neyther doth that Statute of 2. Eliz. in this Kingdome, inflict the penaltie of a *Præmunire* for the first offence, as he surmiseith, but onely losse of goods and Chattels. It is indeede, after once conviction, for the second offence, a *Præmunire* : and for the third, High Treason. If then the penaltie of a *Præmunire* by that Statute be the thing he feared, you see there was no cause for him to feare it, hee being never before convi-

See the Statute  
of 2. Eliz. c. 1.  
in Ireland.

## To the Reader.

sted or attaynted of that offence. And is it not strange, that he being a Lawyer, ( as he saith he is, ) and one of those ( as he likewise affirmeth, ) that were debarred from pleading, for not taking the Oath of Supremacie, should nevertheless be so ignorant in his owne profession, concerning that Statute, ( although himselfe also cite it, ) as not to know what the penaltie is, for the first offence, therein? May not then his owne words be here rightly returned to his owne bosome, that seeing, in his owne facultie he sheweth no greater skill; Can it be imagined, that going out of his owne element, into the great Citie of Divinitie, hee will doe any more, then the fish on the shoare, to gaspe a little for ayre? But admit, that for the first offence upon that Statute, the penaltie had beene a Præmunire, as hee conceived: Will he therefore bee so faint-hearted, in that his supposed Catholicke cause? How doth this agree with that, which he saith afterward, that an Angell or a Man, is bound by the instinct of Nature, to love God better then themselves? Yea, he observeth that in the Naturall bodie of Man, the hand will be content to loose it selfe, for the preservation of the head, and of the rest of the members: And that in the Politicke Body of the Common-weale, any good Subject will imbrace death for the conservation of his King, and the Common-weale: and thereupon he concludes, that so also should any good Christian member of the Mysticall body of Christ, willingly undergo all disasters in the world, in attestation of his love to Christ, and of his willingness to preserve the honour and common good of his Church. And this motive, ( saith he, in that his Epistle Dedicatorie, ) made him, ( though a Lawyer, ) to interpose himselfe, for the defence of the Mysticall Body of Christ, and to answer, as he hath done, in the behalfe thereof. Now then doth it become him, who seemeth here to be so magnanimous and courageous in his cause, to shew himselfe nevertheless so extremely timorous, as for feare of a Præmunire,

## To the Reader.

nite, not to dare to set his right and true name unto that his Answer?

Yea, the premises being well considered, what reason hath he to taxe me, (as sometimes he doth,) for that being a Lawyer by profession, I neverthelesse meddle in these matters of Divinitie, and concerning Religion? For, I gave before, as I thinke, a sufficient Apologie for these my doings, in the Preface of my former Booke which he answereth not, nor is able to answer. And here I now may and doe further adde, that even this Man, (mine Adversarie) hath by his owne example justified me, inasmuch as he being likewise a Lawyer, (as himselfe affirmeth) doth neverthelesse, (as you see,) by his answering those two Chapters in my Booke, meddle in these matters of Divinitie, and concerning Religion, aswell as I. And not onely his personall example, but the doctrine also, and reason he delivereth, (namely, that every good member of the Mysticall body of Christ, ought to interpose himselfe, for the defence of the honour of Christ, & of his Church,) serveth very strongly to justifie my doings herein, not only as lawfull, but as requisite and necessarie, and such as in dutie ought not to bee omitted. But moreover, why doth he Dedicate that his Answer, being a worke of Divinitie, to his dearest Countie-men, The Lawyers of Ireland, if Lawyers had nothing to doe in these matters of Divinitie, or if the knowledge of things of that kind, did not belong unto them? Yea, who knoweth not, that Lawyers, and men of all professions and estates, have soules to save; and that at the houre of their death, it is not their skill or knowledge in Law, Physicke, or any other their worldly callings & professions, (which serve onely but for this life,) that can doe them that good, or yeeld them that comfort touching the next world & eternall happinesse, that the knowledge of Divinitie, and of Gods true Religion, and the care and observance thereof, in their life time, will be able to afford,

But



## To the Reader.

But being debarred frō pleading for not taking the oath of Supremacie, he saith, he was desirous to reade, what solide arguments I had made to invest the King with the Supremacie: & finding them, (as Belshazzar, being weighed was found, in the Prophecie of Daniel,) minus habens, that is, too light, he Dan. 5. 17. saith he was encouraged to answer them. But first, how cometh he now to answer any part of my Booke, who had said before in the same his Epistle Dedicatory, that he presented it to some of the most learned of his catholicke Clergie, & that none of them after a mature deliberation, held it worthy of an answer? what? will he thinke it worthy of an answer, which those of the most learned of his Catholicke clergie thought it not worthy of? Secondly, if he had weighed my arguments, not with false Romish weights, but with true & divine weights, that is, in such a balance, as God weighed Belshazzar, he would have found them weighty enough, though Belshazzar was found light. Thirdly, little reason hath he to call & account those arguments light, somewhereof be such, as he dares not touch nor meddle with the, but doth, as childrē use to do, who, what they cannot reade, they skippe over: So, what he can no way answer, he pretermitteth: & those which he dare be bold to touch, doe neverthelesse shew themselves to be of that weight and strength, as that he is not able to stirre, or move them, much lesse to remove them, or to lift them up from that ground, whereon they rest. Himselfe doth what he can, to answer them; yet distrusting his owne Answer, as minus habens, (to use his owne wordes against him,) that is, as being too light, weake, and insufficient, hee promiseth a more satisfying Answer that should afterward come forth from those that have more Law and Divinitie, then eyther he, or I. Yea, he saith againe, That my Booke shall be shortly answered, in my owne straine of Divinitie, with the three conditions required by me. So that, both by this his owne answer, as also by that further future promised answer, it is  
verie

## To the Reader.

verie evident, that howsoever in words, hee and his partakers would seeme to slight my Booke, & the matter therein contained, yet revera, and indeede, they thinke the force and strength of it to be such, against both Pope, and Poperie, as that they can have no rest, nor quiet in their mindes, untill they have made, (which they will never be able to doe,) a good, sufficient, and satisfactorie Answer thereunto. As for that hee saith, that if in speed thereof, I had made a solide Compendium of the Law, I had gained an applause: I would have him know, that neyther in this kind of learning, nor in any other, doe I seeke or hunt after ostentation, vaine-glory, popular applause, or prayse of men, (which be the things, that Papists in their writings dee too much affect,) but both in that my former worke, & in this also, the things that I sought & still doe seeke after, is Gods glory, & the advancement, & preferment of his truth & religion, & the due authority, & true honour belonging to our most gracious, & most godly & Christian Sovereigne, which was then K. James, & is now K. Charles his most worthy successor, whom God ever blesse, protect, & preserve: & therewithall the generall & publicke benefit both of Church and Common-weale. I graunt that my profession and place, would have allowed me, to have written of points of Law, and concerning Civill Iustice, and externall Peace: But I have rendered the reason in the Epistle Dedicatorie of my former Booke, why I medled not with those things, Namely, because the pretended Catholickes of this Kingdome, in those points, shewed no refractarinesse or opposition, but good conformitie and obedience: And, that, their defect was onely in the two other points, (viz.) Concerning the Kings Supremacie, and the Religion: whereof therefore, there then was, & still is, greatest neede, and most urgent occasion to treat. Wherefore, hee that in such a Case, would rather have had a Compendium of the Law, then these two most necessarie, and most important matters to bee dealt



## To the Reader.

dealt in for the generall good of the kingdome, seemeth in my understanding, to have made a great dispendium of his wit and judgement.

Neverthelesse hee proceedeth, and saith, that because hee cannot commaund the Presse, he will imploy his endevours, to answer, in a Manuscript, my first Booke; ( he meaneth the first part of my Booke, contayning those two Chapters aforesaid:) But what necessitie was there for him thus to publish his Answer in a Manuscript, which he might have put in Print, if he had so pleased? For, although he could not commaund the Protestants Presse (neither was it fit he should), yet the Presse, which some say, the Papiests have of their owne, within this kingdome, he might have eyther commaunded or intreated: or if they have no Presse within this kingdome, he might have sent or carried his Answer unto Doway, or to Rhemes, or to some other place beyond the Seas, where it might have bene printed, if they had held it worthy the Printing. Seeing then that hee might have printed it; Why did he rather choose to divulge it in a Manuscript? Did he thinke, that by that course used, he might the more freely speake and write what he listed, and that no man would answer or reply unto it, though he be never so much touched in it, or be the cause, therein handled, of never so great importances? But what reason is there for any man, to slayme, expect, or to be allowed such a priviledge? Tea, inasmuch as mens hearts may be poisoned, and seduced, aswell by Manuscripts, and written Bookes and Pamphlets, as by those that be Printed, especially after they be once scattered and dispersed abroad, ( as this his Answer is ), into diverse mens hands, and are withall supposed by the pretended Catholickes, ( for whose sake all that labour is bestowed ), to contayne nothing but truth: I see not but I may bee as bold to reply to his Manuscript, in Print, ( the cause also so requiring ), as he made bold to answer a part of my Printed Booke, in a Manuscript.

## To the Reader.

Prover. 16. 5.

*And therefore have I there replied unto it, partly in respect of my selfe, whom it concerneth to iustifie, and make good the matter containd in those two Chapters of my former Booke, which he oppugneeth: and partly in respect of himselfe, who seemeth to be tibi suffectus, & over highly conceited of himselfe, whom therefore Salomon in his Proverbs adviseth to answer: and partly & chiefly in respect of the pretended Catholickes of this Nation, whom by that meanes he seeketh to seduce & abuse, in the points both of his Majesties Supremacie, & the Religion: Both which points, (they being so high and eminent), it behooveth all good Christians, and all good Subjects, evermore carefully & dutifully to defend and maintaine. As for that godly, learned, Reverend, and worthy Bishoppe of Meath, whom my Adversary mentioneth in his Epistle Dedicatorie: I shall neede to say nothing of him, because himselfe will ever be best able to speake for himselfe, whensoever anie shall shew themselves in opposition against him.*

*But to proceede with mine Adversary, if he be, (as he saith he is), debarred from pleading for not taking the Oath of Supremacie, Whom can he blame therein, but himselfe, for his so unjust refusing to take so just an Oath? Against which, throughout all his answer, himselfe neyther sheweth, nor is able to shew any good exception: which, no doubt, hee would there have shewed, where the Supremacie was purposely debated, if he had beene able to have shewed it. But to make him yet the more inexcusable (if he will still be obstinate, which I would have neyther him, nor any others, to be), I have here further, and at large, declared the right of the Kings Supremacie, over all manner of Persons, and in all kindes of causes, Ecclesiasticall as well as Civill, for his, & all other mens most ample and most full satisfaction in that point. And yet my Adversarie saith, That he will Arme himselfe with little Divinitie, and lesse Philosophie, to enter the lists against mee: which  
though*

## To the Reader.

though it be spoken, (after the Papistick manner), proudly, scornfully, and like another Goliath, yet therein hee speaketh truer then he was aware of. For not to speake of his Philosophy, (which he sheweth indeede to be verie little), this my Reply to his Answer, will discover him to be as very a Punie in Divinitie, (as touching any good skill, or sound judgement, in it), as he is in Law. In somuch that upon reading of this Booke, his answer will appeare to be as good as no Answer, yea that it had beene better for his cause, if hee had beene silent, and spoken nothing in it: Such is the advantage that truth ever getteth against falshood, when falshood dare be so bold, to stand in opposition against it. As for the multitude of his idle words, his many needelesse Sillogismes, his extravagant sentences, and impertinent discourses, I passe them over, for the most part, not vouchsafing an Answer to them: they being inserted, but to fill up paper, to mispend time, and vainely to delight and please himselfe, and his followers. But where he hath alledged any thing that <sup>may</sup> be materiall, and pertinent to the cause, and of weight, or moment, to that have I answered and replied, as was fit I should. In which my reply, I have considered him, not as he is Iohn at Stile, (for in that respect, Iohn at Downe, had beene fittest to reply unto him), but as one that is an Adversarie to that Cause I propounded in my former Booke, what soever his name, or profession be. And therefore doe I not so much answer the Man, as the matter by him objected and alledged.

Now then, although these be the Workes of a Lay-Man, yet if you find truth in them, esteeme them never the worse, because of that: For, non quis dicat, sed quid dicatur, attende: saith Isocrates to Demonicus. And, Sæpè etiam est Holitor valde opportuna locutus. And you know also, who taught to this effect, that plus credendum est vel simplici Laico, Scripturarum proferenti, quam, vel Papæ, vel toti

*Gerfon. de exam.  
doctr. Panor. iii.  
de Elect.  
Caus. quiscasti.*

## To the Reader.

*simul Concilio.* For my part, I desire no further to be beleev'd, then that shall be found true that I write: neyther ought any others in their writings, (be they professed Divines, or whosoever else,) any further to be beleev'd, then so. And yet if that would any thing the more prevail with the pretended Catholickes, I can assure them, that the Positions and Doctrine in both these Bookes of mine delivered, be the Positions, and Doctrine, not onely of one, but of many (and those learned) professed Divines, as is to be seene at large in their sundrie workes and writings, extant against the Papists: which the Papists were never yet able, nor ever will be able substantially and soundly to refell, and confute. And therefore, I have no cause to be ashamed of my Teachers, but doe thinke it rather honour and reputation, freely, ingenuously, and thankfully, to acknowledge, as I doe, where, & of whom,

I have learned these things. But having thus answered his Epistle Dedicatorie, I now proceede to that which followeth.





Of the first Chapter of the former Booke,  
Concerning the Supremacie.



Y Adversarie, before hee cometh to answer to that Chapter in the first part of my former Booke, concerning the Supremacie, busieth himselfe much to declare two Positions: The first is, that the Regall & Priestly powers or Offices, bee distinct: and for prooffe of this, he citeth *Gelasius*,

and some other testimonies. But why doth he thus trouble himselfe in vaine? For this the Protestants doe confesse, namely, that the Prince-hood, and Priest-hood; the Regall and Episcopall Powers or Offices, be things distinct: So that neyther the King may administer, or execute that which is proper or peculiar to the Office of Bishoppes, Pastors, or Ministers Ecclesiasticall: nor on the other side, may any Bishoppe, Pastor, or Minister, by vertue of that his Ecclesiasticall office or calling, intrude, or take upon him, the use or exercise of the Civill, or Temporall sword, which rightly and properly belongeth to Kings Rom. 13.4. and Princes, and to such as have that authoritie derived from them. And therefore doth S. *Chrysostome*, (distinguishing their Offices) say: *Ille cogit, hic exhortatur: Ille habet arma sensibilia, hic arma spiritualia.* The King compe- Chrysost. hom. 4. de verb. Esai. Vidi Dom. leth, the Priest exhorteth: The King hath sensible weapons, the Priest hath spirituall weapons. According whereunto,

2. Cor. 10. 4.

S. Paul also saith of himselfe, and of all Ecclesiasticall Ministers, *That the weapons of their warfare, are not carnall, but mightie through God.* It is true (which my aduersarie saith), that the subject, on which the spirituall authority worketh, is the <sup>soule</sup> ~~will~~ of man: and the subject on which the Regall or Temporall authoritie worketh, is the bodie of man: But this difference, maketh nothing for him, as touching the point in Question: For all men know it, and himselfe will confesse it, (if he be not extreamely perverse), that it is not the Soules of men, but their Bodies, that the King by his Regall authoritie worketh upon, and which he commaundeth, and externally compellerh to dutie, and good obedience (if otherwise they will not become obedient: Neyther doth he punish any offenders in Ecclesiasticall causes, Ecclesiastically, and by Church Censures, (as Bishoppes, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers, doe), but Civilly, & in a Temporall manner, as, namely, by fining, imprisonment, banishment, and such like corporall, & pecuniarie punishments, as properly belong to the Regall & Temporall authoritie, to inflict. But mine aduersarie saith further, that the end whereat the Regall authoritie aymeth, is correspondence of humane societie: witnesse (saith he), S. Paul: *ut quietam & tranquillam vitam agamus*: But why doth he leave out the other words, that follow, namely, *In omni pietate, &c?* Take all the words of S. Paul together, and they be these: *I exhort* (saith he), *that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for Kings, and all that are in authoritie, that we may leade a quiet and peaceable life, ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου & πατρὸς, in all godlinesse and honestie.* By which words so put together, it appeareth, That S. Paul would have Christians to pray thus specially for Kings, and Princes, not onely to this end, which my Adversary supposeth, (*viz.*) for the maintinance and preser-

1. Tim. 2. 1. 2.



servation of externall peace, and correspondencie of humane societie; but to this end also, (and that chiefly) that Pietie, Godlinesse, and Religion, may, by their meanes, be continued, countenanced, and protected amongst them. And this had the Christian Emperors learned, in ancient time: For, *Iustinian*, that Christian Emperour, in his dayes, Novel. Const. 6. spake thus: *The true Religion of God, and honest conversation of the Priests, is our chiefest care.* And in this sort likewise spake *Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*, Emperours, saying: *The search of true Religion, we finde to be the chiefest care of the Imperiall Majestie.* And therefore also did *S. Augustine* Legum Theod. Novel. tit. 3. de Indis & Sacerdotibus. say long agoe, *That it is enjoyned Kings from God, that in their kingdomes, they should commaund good things, and forbid evil things, not onely such things as belong to humane societie, but such things also as belong to Gods Religion.* This cleare and most evident testimonie of *S. Augustine*, to declare the authoritie of Kings, aswell in matters Divine, and concerning Religion, as in matters Civill, & Temporal, I alledged in the first Chapter of my former Booke, *pag. 10.* whereunto neverthelesse, as to many other things in my booke contayned, My Adversarie is pleased to answer nothing.

The second Position he busieth himselfe in, is that the Regall Power or authoritie, is subordinate to the Sacerdotal or Spirituall. It is true, that Kings & Princes, notwithstanding their Regall power, be subordinate and subject to God, and his authoritie. But what of this? Indeepe, if Ecclesiasticall Ministers spake to Kings and Princes, in their owne names, and by their owne authoritie, and uttered their owne will and pleasure, there might be some reason in that which he would conclude: but seeing they are to speake unto them, not their owne will, but the will and word of the Almighty, and in his Name, and as Embassadors

2. Cor. 5 20.

1 Cor. 4. 1. 2.

bassadors, Ministers, Messengers, and servants unto him,  
 no such consequent can be inferred. For if a King send an  
 Esquier, or any other inferior servant of his, on a message,  
 to a Duke, Earle, or other Noble-man of the Realme:  
 This servant speaking in the King his Masters name, and  
 delivering his message, is therein to be obeyed: Will any  
 thereupon conclude; *Ergo*, That Esquier or servant, is  
 greater, or superior, as in respect of himselfe, or of his owne  
 person, then eyther the Duke or the Earle, or the Noble-  
 man? No man, I thinke, will be so absurd. And yet my  
 Adversarie goeth on, and amplifieth the Sacerdotall, and  
 spirituall power, saying: That how much the Soule in per-  
 fection exceeds the Bodie: The eternall blisse, the tempo-  
 rall felicitie: The Divine Lawes, the humane lawes: By so-  
 much doth the Spirituall authoritie exceede the Tempo-  
 rall. But all this while, he should remember and observe,  
 wherein, and in what respects, it is that this excellencie of  
 the one, above the other, doth consist. For as it is true, that  
 in respect of converting soules, and fitting them for Gods  
 kingdome, by preaching of Gods Word, Administring of  
 the Sacraments, and exercise of the Ecclesiasticall Disci-  
 pline; the Spirituall function, and authoritie is to be pre-  
 ferred, before the Regall or temporall: So no lesse true is  
 it, that in respect of the temporall Power of the Sword, ex-  
 ternally to command, compell, and to punish offenders, in  
 causes both Ecclesiasticall, and Civill, the Regall & Tem-  
 porall Office, and Authoritie, is to be preferred before the  
 Episcopall, or Sacerdotall. When therefore he supposeth,  
 that the King or Prince, in respect of the Priest, is but as  
 the bodie is, in respect of the Soule; and that hee hath no  
 more power and authoritie, over Priests and Bishoppes,  
 then the bodie hath over the Soule: How doth he prove  
 this fond conceite? For it is not the credite or testimonie  
 of

of his *S. Thomas*, (as he calleth him,) who lived more then 1200. yeares after *CHRIST*, and was overwhelmed with the corruption of his time, and wedded to the Sea of Rome, that can bee any sufficient prooffe of that idle fantazie: Yea, it is apparant that to some purposes, the Regall Power, & Office, hath in it, the nature, and resemblance of the soule, aswell as the Sacerdottall, or Episcopall hath, to some other purposes. For as the soule commandeth the bodie, so hath the King, power to command the Priest, and may by as good right, punish all manner of offenders, Civilly, and by temporall punishments, as Bishops and Clergie men may punish any Ecclesiastically, and by the Church censures. To make this the better to appeare, beside that which is spoken in my former Booke, observe, first, that *Moses*, who was as a King or a Prince in *Israell*, commanded, not only the *Levites*, which bare the *Arke of the Covenant of the Lord*, and that in a matter Ecclesiasticall, and concerning their very Office: but he commanded also, even *Aaron*, the high Priest, in a matter likewise Ecclesiasticall, and concerning his verie Office, saying thus unto him: *Take the Censer, and put fire therein off the Altar, and put therein Incense: and goe quickly unto the Congregation, & make an Attonement for them: For there is wrath gone out from the Lord, the plague is begun. Then Aaron tooke, as Moses commanded him, &c.* He, moreover, called *Aaron*, the high Priest, to an account, for his bad doings, and reprov'd him for the same: Whereupon *Aaron* answered humbly, and submissively unto him as to his Sovereigne Lord, saying: *Let not the wrath of my Lord waxe fierce, &c.* In like sort did *Aaron* speake unto *Moses* in another place, saying: *My Lord, I beseech thee, &c.* So did also *Abimelech* the high Priest, answer to his king submissively and dutifully, saying thus unto him: *Here am I,*

Deut. 32. 9.

Deut. 31. 25. 26.

Numb. 16. 46. 47

Exod. 32. 21. 22

Numb. 12. 11.

1. Sam. 22. 12. 13

my Lord, &c. Let not the King impute any thing to his servant, nor to all the house of my Father, for thy servant knew nothing of all this, lesse or more. The Prophets likewise, as well as the Priests, and high Priests, did acknowledge this humble submission and subjection unto their kings: as is evident by the example of the Prophet Nathan; who when he came into the presence of the King, he made obeysance to the king, upon his face to the ground, &c.

Ioshua, the successor of Moses did likewise, as a King or Prince, commaund even the Priests and Levites, as well as the rest of the people: as appeareth by the acclamation and answer they made unto him, saying thus: *As we obeyed Moses in all things, so will we obey thee, &c. Who ever shall rebell against thy commandement, and will not obey thy words, in all that thou commandest him, let him be put to death.* And it is further manifest that he also dealt in matters Ecclesiasticall as well as Temporal: for, he would have the children of Israel to be Circumcised, and the Passover to be kept, and the Man that had offended in the excommunicate thing, to be punished. He also builded an Altar for their sacrifices & offerings: He read the whole Law unto them, the blessings and cursings: There was not a word of all that Moses had commanded, which Ioshua read not before all the Congregation of Israel, as well before the Women, and the Children; as the Stranger that was conversant among them. He renewed the Covenant between God and the people, and caused them to put away the strange Gods that were amongst them: In somuch that by his diligent care, and good government, Israel served the Lord, all the dayes of Ioshua.

Likewise of that Godly King Iosiah, it is recorded, that he commanded the high Priest, as well as the other Priests, and dealt in matters also Ecclesiasticall, and concerning  
Gods

1. King. 1. 23.  
&c.

Iosh. 1. 17. 18.

Iosh. 6. 6.

Iosh. 5. 3. 4.

Iosh. 5. 10.

Iosh. 7. 24. 25.

Iosh. 8. 30.

Iosh. 8. 34. 35.

Iosh. 24. 23. 24.  
25. 31.



Gods service and Religion. For, thus it is written of him:  
*That hee commanded Hilkiah the high Priest, and the priests* <sup>2 King. 23. 4.</sup>  
*of the second Order, and the keepers of the Doore, to bring out*  
*of the Temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for*  
*Baal, and for the Grove, and for all the Hoste of heaven ; and*  
*he burnt them without Ierusalem, in the fields of Kedron, and* <sup>2 King. 23. 5.</sup>  
*carried the powder of them into Bethel. And hee put downe*  
*the Chemarims, whom the kings of Iuda had founded to burne*  
*incense in the high places, and in the Cities of Iuda, and about*  
*Ierusalem : and also them that burnt incense unto Baal, to the*  
*Sunne, and to the Moone, and to the Planets, and to all the*  
*Hoste of heaven, &c. He commanded also the Paschever to be*  
*kept, &c. Hee purged Iuda and Ierusalem, from the high pla-* <sup>vers. 21.</sup>  
*ces, the Groves, and the carved and molten Images : Yea, he* <sup>2 Chro. 34. vers.</sup>  
*tooke away all the abominations out of all the countries that* <sup>3-4-7-33.</sup>  
*pertayned to the Children of Israell, & compelled all that were*  
*found in Israell, to serve the Lord their God. Had not also*  
*King Salomon authoritie over the Priests and Levites, and*  
*did not he likewise deale in matters Ecclesiasticall, and*  
*concerning Religion, when he set the courses of the Priests*  
*to their offices, according to the order of David his Father, &* <sup>2 Chro. 8. 14-15</sup>  
*the Levites in their matches, to prayse and minister before the*  
*Priests everie day, and the Porters by their courses at everie*  
*Gate : For sawas the commandement of David, the man of*  
*God? And the Text faith, That they declined not from the*  
*commandement of the King, concerning the Priests, and the*  
*Levites, &c. He removed also Abiathar, from being priest* <sup>1. King 2. 27. 35</sup>  
*unto the Lord, and set Sadoc in his roome. Hee also builded* <sup>1. King 8. 22. 23</sup>  
*an house and Temple unto God : and did dedicate the Temple* <sup>24. 25. 26. 27.</sup>  
*in his owne person.*

Did not also King Asa meddle with men, and matters  
 Ecclesiasticall, when he tooke away the Altars of the strange <sup>2 Chro. 14. 3-4. 5</sup>  
 Gods, and the high places, and brake downe the Images, and

cut downe the groves, and commanded Iuda to seeke the Lord God of their Fathers, and to doe according to the Law & commandement, &c. Therefore the kingdome was quiet before him. And he tooke an oath of all Iuda, that, *Whosoever would not seeke the Lord God of Israell, should be slaine, whether he were small, or great, Man or Woman:* And they sware unto the Lord, with a loud voyce, and with shouting, and with Trumpets, and with Cornets: And all Iuda rejoyced at the Oath: for they had sworne unto the Lord with all their hearts, and sought him with an whole desire, and he was found of them: Hee also deposed Maachab his Mother, from her regencie, because shee had made an Idoll in a Grove: and hee broke downe her Idoll, and stamped it, and burnt it, at the brooke Kidron.

2.Chron.15.12  
13.14.15.16.  
&c.

King Iehosaphat did the like, when he sought the Lord God of his Fathers, and walked in his commandements, and not after the doings of Israell. Therefore the Lord stablished the kingdome in his hand. And all Iuda brought to Iehosaphat presents: and he had riches and honour in abundance. And he lift up his heart unto the wayes of the Lord. Moreover, he tooke away the high Places, and Groves out of Iuda. Hee also sent his Princes, and with them, Priests, and Levites, to teach in the Cities of Iuda, & they taught in Iuda, & had the Booke of the Law of the Lord with them, and went throughout all the Cities of Iuda, and taught the people. Againe, in Ierusalem, Iehosaphat set of the Levites, and of the Priests, and of the chiefe of the Families of Israell, for the judgement and cause of the Lord, &c.

2.Chron.17.3.4  
5.6.7.8.9.

2.Chron.19.8.

Did not also that good and Godly king Hezekiah, shew his authoritie over Priests and Levites, and in matters also Ecclesiasticall, when he opened the doores of the house of the Lord, and brought in the Priests and the Levites, and said thus unto them? Heare me, yee Levites, sanctifie now your selves,

2.Chron.29.3.4  
5.6.7.8.9.10.11  
12.13.14.15.16



selves, and sanctifie the house of the Lord God of your fathers,  
 and carrie forth the filthinesse out of the Sanctuarie, &c. And  
 they gathered their brethren, and sanctified themselves, and  
 came according to the commandement of the King, and by  
 the wordes of the Lord, to clense the house of the Lord: And  
 the Priests went into the inner parts of the house of the Lord  
 to clense it, and brought out all the uncleannesse that they  
 found in the Temple into the Court of the house of the Lord:  
 And the Levites tooke it, to carrie it out, to the brooke  
 Kidron. Hee also commanded the Priests, the Sonnes of <sup>Verf. 21. 2.</sup>  
 Aaron, to offer sacrifices, on the Altar of the Lord: And  
 hee sent to all Israell, and Iuda, & wrote Letters to Ephraim,  
 and Manasseh, that they should come to the house of the  
 Lord at Ierusalem, to keepe the Passeover, unto the Lord God  
 of Israell: Hee appointed the courses of the Priests and Le- <sup>2. Chron. 30. 1.</sup>  
 vites, by their turnes, everie man according to his Office, both <sup>2. Chron. 31. 2.</sup>  
 Priests and Levites, for the burnt offerings, to Minister and  
 to give thanks, and to prayse in the Gates of the Tents of the  
 Lord: Hee also tooke away the high Places, and brake the <sup>2. King. 18. 4.</sup>  
 Images, and cut downe the Groves, and brake in pieces the  
 brazen Serpent that Moses had made: for unto those dayes,  
 did the Children of Israell burne incense to it.

Yea, reade the historie of all, & every one of the God-  
 ly kings of Israell, and Iuda, and you will finde, that they  
 all, as Supreme governors, within their own Dominions,  
 commanded aswell the Priests, as the people, and dealt in  
 matters Ecclesiasticall and concerning Religion, aswell as  
 in matters Civill and Temporall. Why then should not  
 Christian Kings and Princes have the like Authoritie  
 within their Kingdomes, which those good and Godly  
 kings of Israell, and Iuda had within theirs? Will any say  
 that those Kings of Israell, and Iuda, dealt in those mat-  
 ters Ecclesiasticall, by the counsell and adyise of the Pro-

phets, and the Priests? What if they did, or what is this to the matter? For, the Question is not by whose Counsell, or advise, but by whose Authoritie those things were done. Kings, even in Civill and Temporall affaires, be also Counsell'd, and advised by learned, wise, and grave Men: Doth this therefore prove, that they have no Supreme Authoritie, in matters Civill and Temporall? For, (by such a reason), you may aswell conclude against the one, as against the other. The direction then, advise, and counsell, which Bishops or others give to Kings, and Princes in matters eyther Ecclesiasticall or Civill, doth not impeach or oppugne their Supreme commands, or Supreme Authoritie, eyther in the one case or in the other. But some doe then here object, that those Kings and Princes of Israell and Iuda, had an high Priest, or chiefe Priest among them, and therefore that there must be likewise, an high priest, or supreme Pastor in the Christian Church. Howbeit, first the high Priest in that Iudaicall, and Israelliticall Church, was not Supreme, but subject to those Kings, and their command, as before appeareth. Secondly, it is granted, that there is also an high Priest in the Christian Church, but it is not, (as they fondly suppose) the Pope of *Rome*, but CHRIST IESVS onely, (as the Epistle to the Hebrewes abundantly declareth:) who is therefore expressly called and affirmed to be our high Priest: *For such an high Priest,* (saith that Epistle) *it became us to have, which is holy, harmlesse, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher then the heavens:* of which sort, I am sure, the Pope of *Rome* is not. Againe, *S. Peter* sheweth, that not himselfe, much lesse the Pope of *Rome*, his pretended successor, nor any other mortall man whatsoever, but CHRIST IESVS onely, is the Supreme Pastor, or chiefe Shepheard, over all Pastors and Shep-  
heads

*Hebr. 9. 11.*  
*Hebr. 5. 5.*  
*H. b. 4. 14.*  
*Hebr. 7. 26.*

*1. Pet. 5. 4.*

heards of the severall flockes of CHRIST, in the world; and in respect of that his high Prerogative, he is also called the great *Sheepeheard of the sheepe*. So that if any would know, whom God hath appointed to be the high Priest, & the Supreme Pastor, over the whole Christian Church Militant upon earth: They here see, that it is not the Pope, but CHRIST IESVS onely. Yea, as touching the Pope of *Rome*, whom they so much dote upon, they were never yet able, nor ever will be able, to prove, that God hath any where in his Word, constituted and appointed him to be the high Priest, or Supreme Pastor, over all the Pastors and Bishops in the world, much lesse to beare the Supremacie over all Emperors, Kings, and Princes: Yea, for the space of divers hundred yeares after CHRIST, did even the Bishops of *Rome* themselves, acknowledge, and performe, subjection to the Emperors: as appeareth, not onely by those three examples of *Melchisedech, Leo, & Gregory* the great, mentioned in my former Booke, (whereunto my Adversarie is still pleased to answer nothing,) but by other Bishops of *Rome* likewise: For also *Anastasi-  
us* the second, Bishop of *Rome*, spake thus to the Empe-  
rour *Anastasi-  
us*: *Pro fide Catholica, humilis pietati tuae pre-  
cator occurro, &c.* I come, (saith he), an humble suppliant to  
your pietie, for the Catholicke faith. And hee saith further,  
That God would have, not him selfe, though he were the  
Bishop of *Rome*, but the Emperour, *velut eius Vicarium pra-  
sidere in terris, as his vicar, or in his stead, to be the chiefe upon  
earth.* *Pelagius* also the first, a Bishop of *Rome*, writing to  
*Childebert* King of *France*, being required to make a con-  
fession of his faith, that so he might shew himselfe not  
to differ from those, that were of the Orthodoxe beleefe,  
speaks likewise in this humble and duetifull maner unto  
him: *Quanto nobis studio ac labore satagendum est, ut pro*

Hebr. 13. 20.

Epist ad Anast.

Ibid. cap. 6.

Pelag. Epist. 16.  
Concil. edit. Bin.  
tom. 2. pag. 633.

*auferendo suspitionis scandalo, obsequium confessionis nostra Regibus ministremus : quibus nos etiam subditos esse, sancta Scriptura praeiungit : With how great care and labour, ought we to strive, and endeavour, for the taking away of the scandal of suspition, to yeelde the obedience of our confession, unto Kings : to whom, the holy Scriptures also command us to bee subject. From him, passe to the times of Agatho, another Bishop of Rome, in whose dayes, was assembled the sixth Councell of Constantinople : In that Councell, there is an Epistle of his, to the Emperor, who required him to send some to supply his place, in that Councell : To whom Pope Agatho answereth, and writeth in that Epistle, That to those things which the Emperor commanded, hee would promptam obedientiam exhibere, yeelde ready obedience, Againe, he saith : Hoc Imperialis benignitas vestra clementer iubens, hortata est, & nostra pusillitas, quod iussum est, obsequenter implevit. This, your Imperiall benignitie, gently commanding, hath required : and our meanesse, What was commanded hath obediently performed. Yea, he speaketh yet further, in this most submissive sort, to the Emperor: Obsecro itaque piissime atque clementissime Auguste, atque una cum mea exiguitate, omnis Anima Christiana, flexo genu, suppliciter deprecatur, &c. I therefore beseech you, most pious and clement Emperor, and together with my meanesse, every Christian soule with bended knee, humbly intreateth, &c. Goe on to the times of Pope Hadrian, in whose daies it was, That the second Nicene Councell was assembled: There also you may observe, in what humble sort, he likewise writeth to the Emperor: Deprecantes cum magna cordis dilectione mansuetissimam vestram Clementiam, & tanquam praesentialiter humo stratus, & vestris vestigijs provolutus, quae, & coram Deo deprecor : Praying with great affection of heart, your most milde Clemencie, and as in your presence*

*Concil. Constant.  
6. act. 4. C. ncil.  
edit. Bin. tom. 3.  
pag. 13.*

*Sub firm.*

*Concil. Nicen. 2.  
B. piff. 1. Concil.  
edit. Bin. tom. 3.  
pag. 257.*



sence being cast upon the ground, and prostrate, (saith he,) before your feete, I beseech, and in the presence of God, doe earnestly desire, &c. And in another Epistle againe, hee speaketh thus. *Obscrantes ex animi fervore, vestram mansuetudinem obtestando, & veluti praesentes genibus advoluti & coram vestigia pedum volutando, ego cum fratribus coram Deo supplico, obtestor, &c.* Beseeching you out of the fervor of our minde, by intreating your gentlenesse, and as if wee were present, being cast upon our knees, and kneeling before your presence, I with my brethren in the presence of God, am an humble suppliant, and doe earnestly beseech, &c. By all which you see, verie clearly and infallibly, that for the space of many hundred yeates after CHRIST, even the Bishops, and Popes of Rome themselves, were, and so did declare themselves to be, not superiors, but inferiors, yea humble suppliants and subject to the Emperors: and consequently, that the Emperors in all those times, as well *de iure*, as *de facto*, had the Supremacie over them, as well as other Bishops. For, so it appeareth, ~~that~~ that they had, and ought to have: in as much as Pope Pelagius himselfe, expressely affirmeth, (as you heard before,) that the holy Scriptures did so command.

*Quibus nos est.  
am subditos esse,  
sanctae Scripturae  
praecipunt:  
inquit Pelagius.*

2. ~~Secondly~~ It being a thing, verie demonstratively evident, That the Christian Emperors, in those former and ancient times, had the Supremacie, and command, even of the Bishops of Rome, as well as of other Bishops: let us now proceede, and see, whether they did not also deale in matters Ecclesiasticall, as well as the good and Godly kings of Israell and Iuda did: And it is also very apparant, that they did. For prooffe whereof, Constantine, that Godly and Christian Emperor, spake in this sort: By my Ministers, (saith he,) mankind is brought to the keeping and observing of the most sacred Law: by the service which I performe

*Enseb. de vita  
Const. lib. 2. c. 18  
Socrat. lib. 1.  
cap. 22. las.*



to God, all things every where, are settled in order. Yea the barbarous Nations, which till this time, knew not the trueth, now praysse the name of God sincerely, whom they reverence for dread of us. He also called Councells, when cause required. He decreed that Heretickes should have no Temples, and that in no place publicke or privat, from that day forward, any of their assemblies should be permitted.

Euseb. de vita  
Const. lib. 1. c. 37  
& lib. 3 cap. 63.

Socras lib. 1. cap.  
20. lat.

When the Councell of *Tyrus* was assembled, he commanded them first, to discusse the trueth of such crimes, as were objected against *Athanasius*. *Athanasius* also was loth to come before that Councell, save that he feared the threatening Letters of *Constantine*, written to this effect:

Euseb. de vita  
Const. lib. 4. c. 42.

If any, (saith he), which I thinke not, in contempt of Our mandate, sayle to come before you, Wee will send a warrant from our Royall Authoritie, that he shall bee banished: To teach him, what it is for Bishops, and Cleargie men, to withstand the commandement of the Chiefe Ruler, defending the trueth. Wherefore *Athanasius* and the Bishops of his part appeared: But finding that Councell very partiall, they appealed from them to the Emperor. And *Athanasius* himselfe fled to the Emperor, beseeching him to send for the Bishops of that Councell, & to examine their A&ts, which that Christian Emperor did accordingly, and thereupon wrote thus to the whole Councell: *Your Synod*,

Athanas. apol. 2.  
Cum multis vi-  
deretur,  
Socras lib. 1. ca. 31.  
lat.

Socras lib. 1. cap.  
22. lat.

(saith he), hath decreed, I know not what, in a tumult, and uprore, whilst you seeke to pervert trueth, by your pestilent disorder, for hatred against your fellow Bishops: But the divine providence will, I doubt not, scatter the mischief of your contention, and make it plaine in our sight, whether your Assembly hath had any regard of trueth or no. You are therefore, all of you, to resort hither, to shew the reason of your doings: for so it doth seeme good and expedient unto me. For which end, I willed this rescript to be sent unto you, That as

many

many of you as were present at the Councell of Tyrus, without delay repayre to the place of our abode, there to give account, how sincerely and soundly yee have judged, and that before me, whom your selves shall not denie to be the sincere Minister of God, in these Cases. Observe yet further, That Iustinian, that Christian Emperor, in his Code, ~~circ~~ <sup>cod. lib. 1. tit. 4. 2</sup> <sup>3. tit. 5. 7. 9. 11.</sup> directh many and sundry Lawes, made by former Emperors, concerning matters Ecclesiasticall: As namely, touching the Christian Faith, Baptisme, and Churches, and touching Heretickes, Apostatas, Jewes, and Infidels. And in his Authentickes, he maketh many new Constitutions: Concerning the Sacraments, in what places, by what persons, with what loudnesse of voyce they should be ministred: Concerning Synods or Councells, when they shall be kept, what things shall be reformed in them, and what Canons of Councells shall stand in the same strength, with his Lawes. Concerning Priests, Deacons, and other Servitors in the Church, He limiteth their Age, Condition, Learning, and good report, before they be received to that Office, and their diligent, sober and chaste behaviour afterward: And concerning Bishops, how they shall be chosen, what manner of men they should be, both for life and doctrine, what causes they should meddle withall in their Consistories, what punishment they should undergoe for wrongfull excommunication, and other offences, &c. And he saith further, That there is no kinde of thing exempted from the Prince his inquisition, who hath received from God, a common Regiment and Sovereignetie, over all men. And those things which concerne God, must, saith he, be preserved from corruption, by the Sacred Prelates, and civill Magistrates: but most of all, by our Majestie, who use not to neglect any divine causes.

Cod. lib. 1. tit. 4. 2  
3. tit. 5. 7. 9. 11.

Novel. conf. 5. 7.  
C. 42. 123.

Novel. conf. 123  
131.

Novel. conf. 5.  
C. 131. 3. 67. 79.  
C. 5. 123. 133.  
C. 6. C. 123.

Novel. conf. 123

But proceede, and goe on further to the times of Charles the great, who was Emperor of the West parts, about  
Legum Francia  
libr. 1.

eight hundred yeares after CHRIST, and therein consider the *Directions*, *Chapters*, or *Laves* made by him, which *Ansegiſus* gathered together, within a few yeares after his death. For thereby shall you likewise clearly perceive, that *Kings* and *Princes*, even in those dayes, did meddle both with Persons, & causes Ecclesiasticall. I will here recite some of them unto you for your better and most full satisfaction in this point. (*viz.*)

Cap. 1. That no man excommunicate in one place, should be taken into Communion in another place.

Cap. 2. That when any Clarke is Ordered, his faith and life be first exactly tried.

Cap. 3. That no strange Clarke be received or Ordered without Letters of Commendation, and licence from his owne Bishop.

Cap. 50. & 25. That no man be made Priest under thirtie yeares of age: neyther then at randome, but appointed and fastned to a certaine Cure.

Cap. 11. That no Bishop meddle with giving orders in another mans Diocesse.

Cap. 20. That onely the Bookes Canonically be read in the Church.

Cap. 42. That the false name of *Martyres*, and uncertaine memories of *Saints*, be not observed.

Cap. 19. That Sunday be kept, &c.

Cap. 82. That the Pastors and Ministers rightly preach and teach the people committed to their charge.

*Ibidem.* That they suffer not any man under them, to propose to the people, opinions of their owne devising, not agreable to the holy Scriptures, but shall themselves teach profitable, and good doctrine, tending to life everlasting, and instruct others to doe the like. And first of all, they shall teach all men generally to believe, the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, to bee one Omnipotent, and Eternall, and invisible God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, and of all things in them; And that there

is but one God-head, Substance and Majestie, in the three Persons of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost.

Item : They shall preach , That the Sonne of God tooke *E. dom cap. 31.* flesh by the working of the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary, (shee remainning alwayes a Virgin,) for the salvation and reparation of mankind : That he suffered, was buried, the third day rose againe, and ascended into heaven, and that he shall come againe in Majestie to judge all men, &c.

Item : They shall diligently preach the Resurrection of the *ibidem* dead.

Item : They shall teach all men, with all diligence, for what *ibidem* offences they shall be condemned with the Drivell, to paines everlasting : The Apostle telling us, That the workes of the flesh are manifest, which are, fornication, uncleannesse, wantownesse, idolatrie, witchcraft, enmities, emulations, wrath, contentions, seditions, heresies, envie, murders, drunkenesse, gluttonie, and such like : of which I tell you now, as I told you before, (saith the Apostle,) That they which commit such things, shall not inherit the kingdome of God. These things therefore, which the great Preacher of the Church of God, reckoneth by name, let them be with all care prohibited ; remembring how terrible that saying is, That they which doe such things, shall not come into Gods kingdome.

Moreover, Admonish them, (saith he,) with all ear- *ibidem* nestnesse, concerning the love of God and of their neighbour, concerning Faith and Hope in God, Humilitie, Patience, Chastitie, Continencie, Liberalitie, Mercie, giving of Almes, acknowledging of their sinnes, And concerning forgiving of such as trespass against them, according to the Lords Prayer: assuring them, that they which doe these things shall obtaine the kingdome of God. This we charge and enioyne you, (saith he, speaking to the Bishops and Cleargie men,) with so

*much the more diligence, because we know, that in the latter times, shall come false teachers, as the Lord in the Gospell foretold, and his Apostle Paul, to Timothy, testifieth.*

*Caroli prefat. in  
Leges Franc.*

*And againe he saith thus; therefore, (you Pastors of Christs Church, and Guides of his flocke, &c.) have we directed Commisioners unto you, who together with you, are, in our Name and by our Authoritie, to redresse those things which neede reformation: And to this end, have wee here annexed certaine brieve Chapters, of Canonically, or Ecclesiasticall institution, such as we thought meetest. Let no man thinke or judge this our admonition to Godlinesse, to be presumptuous, whereby wee seek to reforme things amisse, to cut off things superfluous, and to bring men to that which is right, but let them rather receive it, with a charitable minde. For in the Booke of Kings, wee reade, what paines that Godly King Iosias tooke, to bring the kingdome given him of God, to the true worship of the same God, by visiting, correcting, and instructing them: not that we compare our selves with his Sanctitie, but that wee should alwayes imitate such examples of the Godly. Here wee see, the reason, why these Chapters or Lawes were made, and Commisioners appointed, and sent from the King, to put them in execution: and that also the examples of Iosiah, and such other Godly Kings of Israel and Iuda, are to be made patternes and precedents, and to be imitated by all Kings and Princes in the Christian Church, as touching the good care, endeavour and paines, they are to take everie way they can, for the advancement of Gods Religion.*

*Legum Franc.  
lib. 2. cap. 1.*

*After Charles the great, were Lodowicke and Lotharius, Emperors: which Emperors also spake thus to the Bishops and Magistrates of their Dominions. You have all, no doubt, eyther seene or heard, that our Fathers and Progenitors, after they were chosen by God to this place, made this  
their*



their principall studie, how the honour of Gods holy Church,  
 and the state of their kingdome might be decently kept: And <sup>cap. 2.</sup>  
 we for our parts, following their example, seeing it hath plea-  
 sed God to appoint us, that we should have care of his Church,  
 and of this kingdome, are very desirous, so long as we live, to  
 labour earnestly for three speciall things, viz. to defend, exalt,  
 & honour Gods holy Church, and his servants, in such sort, as  
 is fit: to preserve Peace, and, to doe Iustice to all the people. And  
 though the chiefe of this service consist in our person, yet by <sup>cap. 3.</sup>  
 Gods and Mans Ordinance, it is so devided, that everie one of  
 you, in his place and calling, hath a part of our charge: So  
 that I should be your admonisher, and you all my coadjutors.  
 Yea, not only did these Emperors extend their Authority  
 to causes Ecclesiasticall and concerning Religion, but had  
 also the Supremacie over all Bishops, even over the Bishop  
 of Rome himselte, in their times: For so it appeareth by the  
 submission, which Leo the fourth, Bishop of Rome, made  
 to this Lodowicke the Westerne Emperor, in these words.  
 If, (saith he), we have done otherwise then well, and not dealt <sup>Caus. 2. quest. 7.</sup>  
 uprightly with those that are under us, we will amend all that <sup>Cap. No. 5.</sup>  
 is amisse, by the judgement of your highnesse: beseeching your  
 highnesse, for the better triall of these surmises, to send such, as  
 in the feare of God, may narrowly sift, not onely the matters  
 informed, but all our doings great and small, as well as if your  
 Majestie were present: So that by lawfull examination all  
 may be finished, and nothing left undiscussed, or undetermi-  
 ned. In all things, great and small, this Bishop of Rome,  
 (as you see,) submitted himselte to the Emperor, and to  
 those Commissioners, which he would please to send, for  
 the sifting and examination of those matters layd to his  
 charge, promising to amend all that was amisse in him,  
 according to the Emperors owne judgement. Wherefore  
 this was not a matter of modesty, or courtesie, in the Pope,  
 (as

*Ibidem.*  
*Cap. Petrum.*

( as *Gratian* most ungratiously would perswade, ) but a matter of bounden ductie, and without all dissembling, and seriously meant and intended by him, in such manner and sort, as he by those his words plainly declareth. And consequently you now perceiue verie fully, ( I hope, ) that for the space of eight hundred yeares and more after CHRIST, the Bishops of *Rome* were subject to the Emperors, and that the Christian Emperors also had Authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill, within their Empyres.

But here now doe some Papists take exception and answer, as touching *Salomon*, his displacing of *Abiathar* the high Priest, and putting *Sadoc* in his place: that *Salomon* did this, as he was a Prophet, not as hee was a King. But, first, this is but a meere supposition and conceit, not found warranted in the Text. Yea, the untruth of it, may appeare if you please but to reade the Chapter: For the offence which *Abiathar*, the high Priest, had committed, was High Treason, in joyning with *Adoniah*, against King *Salomon*, for the kingdome: *Ioab* also was in the same Treason and Conspiracie. The King therefore cauted *Adoniah* to be put to death: he caused also *Ioab* to be put to death: & touching *Abiathar* the high Priest, hee was also as worthy of death as the rest, although for some causes and respects, he was spared for that time. Thou art worthie of death, ( saith the King. ) but I will not this day kill thee, because thou barest the Arke of the Lord God before *Dauid* my Father, and because thou hast suffered in all, wherein my Father hath beene afflicted. So *Salomon* cast out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord. And the King put *Benaiah* in the roome of *Ioab* over the Hoste: and the King set *Sadoc* the priest, in the roome of *Abiathar*. In which words you see, that *Salomon* doing these things, is not styled or called

1. King. 2. 22. 23.  
 24. 25. 26. 27. 18  
 29. 19c.

1. King 3. 26. 27.

2. Cor. 55.

called by the name of a Prophet, but, expressly, by the name of a King: thereby signifying and declaring, that what *Salomon* did touching the removing of *Abiathar*, and putting *Sadoc* in his place, he did it as a King, as well as when he put *Benaiah* in the place of *Joab*. Secondly, you see, that the offence which *Abiathar* had committed, was treason, and that therefore he deserved to die, as well as *Adoniah*, or *Joab*, or any other of the conspirators: But yet for the reasons and respects before mentioned, hee would not, then, put him to death, though he had deserved it, but was content, in lieu thereof, for that time, to inflict this punishment upon him, to have him removed from his Priest-hood. Now to deale in cases of Treason, and to be a Iudge of matters concerning life and death, and to award execution of death, or in mercie to mitigate, and alter the severitie of that punishment, and in lieu thereof, to have a milder, or not so severe a punishment as death, to be inflicted, be things, not properly belonging to the office of a Prophet, but to the office of a King, they doe rightly and properly enough belong. And therefore what *Salomon* did herein, it is evident that he did it as a King, & not as a Prophet. And consequently it still remayneth firme and sure, even by this example of King *Salomon*, as also by other examples mentioned in my former Booke, (whereto my adversarie is still pleased to answere nothing), that Kings, as Kings, have power to place Bishops, and againe to displace them, when there is cause, and to put others in their roome.

And as touching *Moses*, some Papists doe also answere, that he was a Priest, & the *high Priest*, (for so saith *Bellar-* mine,) and therefore, that *Aaron* performed that reverence, obedience, and subjection to him that hee did, as being *high Priest*. My Adversarie likewise saith the same,

*Bellar. de verb.  
Dei lib. 3. cap. 41*

Deut. 33. 5.

Num. 3. 10.

Num. 16. 46. 47

Num. 3. 12.

41. 45.

Lyra in Num.

3. 12.

Ibidem.

that God Almighty made *Moses* an high Priest, and citeth for prooffe of it *Num. 27.* but there is no such thing written in that Chapter, nor in any other Chapter of the whole Bible beside. I read, that *Moses* was as a *King* or *Prince* in *Israell*: but I no where read, throughout the whole Booke of God, that God constituted *Moses* to be the high Priest: yea it is well knowne, that in *Moses* time, *Aaron* was the high Priest: what necessitie then was there for *Moses* also, to be an high Priest? But that *Moses* was no Priest properly so called, much lesse an high Priest, is thus made manifest. For if *Moses* were a Priest, it must be eyther before the consecration of *Aaron*, or after: But after the consecration of *Aaron* and his Sonnes to the Priest-hood, it is cleare, that not *Moses*, but *Aaron*, and his Sonnes were the Priests, as having the Priest-hood appointed, and specially given unto them by Gods owne direction. Thou (saith God to *Moses*,) shalt appoint *Aaron*, and his Sonnes, to execute their Priests offices: and the stranger that commeth were, shall be slaine. So that none but *Aaron*, and those that were of his seede might execute the Priests office. For which cause, *Moses* neyther did, nor durst execute the Priests office, but commanded *Aaron* to burne Incense, and to make an attonement for the people. Wherefore it is very apparant, that after the consecration of *Aaron*, *Moses* was not a Priest. And, that *Moses* was also no Priest before the consecration of *Aaron*, is likewise very evident: because before that time, the priest-hood was annexed to the birth-right, and did belong to the first borne, in whose place the *Levites* afterward came, and were appointed. So saith *Lyra*, reporting the received judgements of the best interpreters, that, *Ante legem datam, ad Primogenitos pertinebat offerre sacrificia*: Before the Law given, it belonged to the first-borne to offer sacrifices. Again, hee saith expressly, that

Levite



*Levita successerunt loco eorum. The Levites succeeded in their place. And againe he saith: Sacerdotium fuit annexum Primogenitura, usque ad legem datā per Moysen: The Priest-hood was annexed to the first borne, untill the Law given by Moses.* *Lev. in Gen. 14.*

Now, of these two brothers, *Moses & Aaron*, (the Sonnes of *Amram*,) it is manifest, that, not *Moses*, but *Aaron*, was the eldest, and first borne. For we reade in *Num. 33.* That *Aaron* was one hundred twentie and three yeares old, when he died: But *Moses*, outliving *Aaron*, was but one hundred and twentie yeares old when he died. So that *Aaron*, appeareth, questionlesse and undoubtedly, to be the elder brother and the first borne: and consequently even by the right of Primogeniture, did the Priest-hood belong to *Aaron*, and not to *Moses*. *Num. 33. 39.*

If any say, that the birthright was sometime taken from the eldest, by a speciall appointment of God, and given to the younger: it hath no place here. For no such especiall appointment from God can be shewed in this case: Yea *Aaron* was so farre from loosing this priviledge of his birthright, by any appointment from God, that cleane contrarywise, he had the Priest-hood famously confirmed to him, by God himselfe. *Thou*, (saith God speaking to *Aaron*,) *and thy Sonnes with thee*, shall *keepe your Priests office*. *Deut. 34. 7.*

In asmuch then as it is apparant, that *Moses* was no Priest, neyther before the consecration of *Aaron*, nor after, it must therefore be concluded, that he was no Priest at all, but was, as the Scripture calleth him, as a *King*, or a *Prince*. A second reason is this, *viz.* *Deut. 33. 5.*

That *Ioshua* was appointed by God himselfe to succede *Moses* in his place, and office: But it is certaine, that *Ioshua* his successor, was no Priest, but a civill Magistrate: even the chiefe ruler and commander under God, both of the *Priests*, & *People of Isræll*, in his times, as before appeareth: and therefore also must *Moses* be so supposed. *Deut. 31. 14. & Num. 27. 17. 18. Ios. 1. 16. 17. 18.*



Psal. 99. 6.

2. Sam. 8. 18.

1. Chron. 18. 17.

2. Sam. 20. 16.

jected out of Psal. 99. That *Moses* and *Aaron* were among the Priests: doth this prove them therefore to be Priests, because they were among them? Howbeit, the Hebrew word, there used, is *Cohanim*, which signifieth aswell *Princes*, (as *Priests*,) or any that be in high, eminent, and honourable place: as in 2. Sam. 8. *The Sonnes of David, are said to be Cohanim, that is, chiefe Rulers*: For so it is also explained in 1. Chron. 18. Where it is said of the Sonnes of David, *That they were chiefe or principall men, about the King*. Againe it is said in 2. Sam. 20. that *Ira*, the *lairite* was, *Cohen le David*, that is, a *Prince*, or *chiefe Ruler about David*: For it were absurd, and against the Law of God, that then was, to suppose *Ira* to bee a Priest, who was a meere stranger, and not of the Tribe of *Levi*. Although then *Aaron* was a Priest, yet when it is said of *Moses* and *Aaron* together, that they were *Cohanim*; It may signifie verie well, that they were great Rulers, or men of high and eminent place in *Israell*, the one in respect of the civill Magistracie, and the other in respect of the Priest-hood. But for any to say, and argue thus: *Moses* was a *Cohen*, or reckoned amongst the *Cohanim*: Ergo hee was a Priest by his proper office and function, is a plaine *non sequitur*, and no better, then if you should likewise argue and say: *Ira* the *lairite* was a *Cohen*, and the Sonnes of *David*, were also *Cohanim*: Ergo these were Priests by their proper office and function.

If you further object, that *Moses* was of the Tribe of *Levi*, and *Aarons* brother: yet neyther doth that prove him therefore to be a Priest: For everie one that was of the Tribe of *Levi*, was not a Priest. Yea, even the *Priests*, and

Numb. 3. 6. 7. 8.

9. 10.

1. Chro 6. 48. 49.

Numb. 18. 3. 6.

*Levites*, were distinguished: For, *Aaron* and his Sonnes, were appointed to the office: But of the *Levites*, it is said, *they shall not come neere to the Altar, least they die*. So that although the

the *Levites*, were of the Tribe of *Levi*, yet wee see they might not meddle with the Priests office, least they should die. And therefore also, *Moses*, though he were *Aarons* brother, and of the Tribe of *Levi*, yet was he not therefore a Priest, or to execute the Priests office. Neyther did he execute the office of a *Levite*, as the *Levites* used to doe, in wayting and tending upon the Priests, and as being in office inferior unto them, and at their command. Yea, it is before shewed and apparant, that *Moses*, although he were of the Tribe of *Levi*, yet was hee so farre exalted and advanced, as that he was by place and office, as a *King* or *Prince* in *Israell*, and commanded both *Priests* and *Levites*, and not onely the Tribe of *Levi*, but all the other Tribes of *Israell* also, as *Ioshua* his successor likewise did.

Yet some to prove *Moses* to be a Priest, doe alledge, that he sacrificed, and for this, doe cite *Exod. 24. 5.* But the words of that Text, be not, that *Moses* did sacrifice, but *That he sent young men to sacrifice*: which were indeede the first borne of the children of *Israell*, to whom the Priest-hood did then belong, it being a thing done, before the institution of the *Leviticall priest-hood*. Other some againe doe alledge, that *Moses* did consecrate and annoynt *Aaron* and his Sonnes, to the Priest-hood: And that therefore he was a Priest. But this also followeth not, especially in the first erection of the *Leviticall priest-hood*. For though *Moses* were a Prince & a civill Magistrate, yet whē God gave him a direct and speciall commandement, to consecrate and annoynt *Aaron*, and his Sonnes, he was bound to doe it. And that he was expressly so commanded, is apparant by the Text it selfe, where God spake thus to *Moses*: *Thou shalt bring Aaron and his Sonnes, unto the dore of the Tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water: And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, and*

*Exod. 24. 5.*

*Exod. 40. 13.  
13. 14. 15. 16.*

shalt annoynt him, & sanctifie him, that he may minister unto me in the Priests office: Thou shalt also bring his Sonnes, and cloth them with garments, and shalt annoynt them, as thou didst annoynt their Father, that they may minister unto me in the Priests office: For this annoyntment shall be asigne, that the Priest-hood shall be everlasting unto them, throughout their generations. So Moses did according to all that the Lord commanded him: So did he. This sheweth then, that Moses was duertifull and obedient, in performing Gods commandement in this case: But it is no prooffe, that therefore he was a Priest. For even a civill Magistrate, not onely may, but ought to consecrate, and annoynt men to the office of Priest-hood, if he be so required, and commanded from God himselfe, as Moses was: wherefore it still remayneth firme, that what reverence, subjection, and obedience, Aaron the high Priest performed to Moses, he did it to him, not as being any Priest, or high Priest, but to him as being as a Prince or King in Israell, that had the supreme commandement, and rule both of the high Priest and of the rest of the Priests and of the Levites, and of all the people within that Common-weale. So that now I trust you verie fully perceave, that Moses and Ioshua, and the good and Godly Kings of Israell and Iuda, had Authoritie, as well over the high Priests, as all other Priests and Levites, & in causes also Ecclesiasticall, as well as civill and Temporall. And that the Christian Emperors for the space of many hundred yeares after CHRIST, had likewise the Supremacie over all persons, and in all causes as well Ecclesiasticall, as Civill, within their Empyres and Dominions.

3. ~~Thirdly~~. But my Adversarie objecteth, that famous Hosius Cordubensis, reproving the Arrian Emperour Constantius, wisheth him, (as Athanasius testifieth), not to meddle in

Athanas Epist. ad  
solitarium viii  
agenses.

in Ecclesiasticall matters. It is true, that *Hosius Cordubensis*, did, and had just cause to reprove *Constantius*, and to wish and advise him not to meddle in matters Ecclesiasticall, in such sort, as he did: he using, or rather abusing, all his authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, to the mantaynance of the *Arrians* and *arrianisme*, against the true Christian, and Orthodoxe Bishops, and against the truth of the God-head of CHRIST. For, *Athanasius* in the same Epistle sheweth, that *Paulinus*, and other Bishops, being called before the Emperor, the Emperor commanded them to subscribe against *Athanasius*, and to communicate with the *Arrians*. They mervayled at this, and answering that the Ecclesiasticall Canons would not suffer them to doe so, He replied: *But, what I will, let that be taken for a Canon: The Bishops of Syria endure this speech of mine. Eyther therefore doe you, as I will you, or else goe you also into banishment.* And when the Bishops held up their hands to God, and proposed their reasons, shewing him, *That the kingdome was not his but Gods, of whom he received it, & that it was to be feared, least he that gave it him, would speedily take it from him: Setting also before his eyes the day of judgement, and advising him, Not to subvert Ecclesiasticall order, nor to bring the Arrian heresie into the Church of God: He, would neyther heare them, nor permit them to speake, but grievously bending his browes for that they had spoken, and shaking his Sword at them, commanded them to be taken away.* Yea, what crueltie, tyrannie, and persecution was used, and rayled by *Constantius*, in the behalfe of the *Arrians*, against the Orthodoxe and right beleeving Christians, is further declared by the same *Athanasius*: shewing, that even Pagans were set to invade the Churches of the right and true Christians, and to beate the people with slaves and stones. The Bishops, Priests, & Monkes, were



were bound with chaines, and scourged with rods. The women were haled by the haire to the judgement seate, The virgins were tossed by the fire, and whipt with prickles, others were banished, strangled, and trampled under feete to death, and their limmes and joyntes rent and torne a sunder, after they were dead. In somuch that Athanasius crieth out, saying: Who was not amazed at these things? Who would yeeld them the name of heathen men, much lesse the name of Christian men? Who would thinke them to have conditions of men, and not rather of beasts? Yea, who perceived not the Arrians to be crueller then beasts? The strangers standing by, yea the very Ethnickes, detested the Arrians, as Antichrists, and Butchers of men. Oh new-found heresie, (saith he,) which in villanies and impieties, hast put on the fulnesse of the Diuell, how great soever it be. Againe, (he saith,) Whom hath not Constantius banished, that was accused by the Arrians? When did he not give them both audience, and allowance? Whom did he ever admitt to say any thing against them? Or what did he not admitte, which they spake against others? He ever doth that which the Arrians would have, and they againe say that which him liketh. And Athanasius saith yet further of him: That whensoever he called an Assembly, Iudgement, or Councell of Bishops, it was but for a shew: For he did never thelesse what himselfe listed. What libertie for perswasion, or what place of advise, (saith he,) is there, when he that contradiceth, shall for his labour, loose eyther his life, or his country? Why hath the Emperour gathered so great a number of Bishops, partly terrified with threats, partly inticed with promises, to condescend, that they will no longer communicate with Athanasius. This violent oppressing of Bishops in their Synods or Councells, & working them to his owne will, doth S. Hilary also witnesse, saying thus unto him. Thou gatherest Synods or Councells, and when they be shut up together

*Ibidem.*



together in one Citie, thou terrifiest them with threats, thou pinchest them with hunger, thou lamest them with cold, thou depravest them with dissembling. Again, (hee saith,) *Oh ibidem.* thou wicked one, what a mockery dost thou make of the Church? Onely dogges returne to their vomite: and thou compellest the Priests of CHRIST, to suppe up those things which they have spet forth, and commandest them in their confessions, to allow that which before they condemned. What Bishops hand hast thou left innocent? What tongue hast not thou forced to falsehood? Whose heart hast not thou brought to the condemning of his former opinion? Thou hast subjected all to thy will, yea to thy violence. Good cause therefore had *Hosius Cordubensis* to say as he did unto that Emperor, Meddle not (Emperor) with Ecclesiasticall matters, (namely, in this sort, as thou dost) for the maintaynance of arrianisme, & making thy will to stand for a law, &c. For if you will have these words, *Ne temisceas Ecclesiasticis*, Meddle not with Ecclesiasticall matters, to be taken absolutely and without restriction, to debarre Kings and Princes from all intermedling in Ecclesiasticall causes, any kind of way, such an exposition were not onely contrarie to the Acts of *Constantine*, the Lawes of *Iustinian*, the Chapters, and doings of *Charles the Great*, and the Historie of all the Christian Emperors, for the space of many hundred yeares after CHRIST, but it were also contrarie to the opinion and practise even of *Athanasius* himselfe, who is the reporter of those words of *Hosius*: For, it is evident, that *Athanasius* himselfe was never of that minde, to exclude Christian Kings and Princes from all intermedling in causes Ecclesiasticall: Yea, he was a cleare approver of that Authority in them: as appeareth by this, That when he was commanded to conferre with one *Arius*, concerning matters of Faith: He answered, *Who is so farre out of his wits,*

Disput. Alban.  
cum Ario La-  
dicea habita.  
Athanas. apol. 2.  
Socrat. lib. 1. cap.  
21. 22. lat.

that he dare refuse the commandement of the Prince? Yea the Emperors commandement made him to appeare before the Councell of Tyrus, and finding that Councell not to be indiffer-  
rent, but partially affected, he and the rest of the Orthodoxe Bishops that tooke part with him, appealed to the Emperor himselfe. He also in person fled to the Emperor, desiring him to send for the Bishops of the Councell of Tyrus, and to examine their doings, which the Christian Emperor did accordingly. So that it is manifest, that *Athanasius* did approve of the Authoritie of the Emperors in Ecclesiastickall causes, albeit hee would not have them to use their authoritie cruelly or tyrannically, to serve their owne violent wills and pleasures, nor thereby to doe any thing whatsoever against CHRIST, and his Religion, as that Arrian Emperor *Constantius* did. But when all this is granted, it maketh nothing against those Christian Emperors, Kings and Princes, which in good sort use their authoritie, not against CHRIST, (as he did,) but for CHRIST, his truth, and Religion. It is true, that the same *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba*, spake further unto the Emperor in this sort: God, (saith he), hath committed the Empyre to thee, to us the things of the Church. And as he that envieith thy Empyre, contradicteth the ordinance of God: So take thou heede, least drawing unto thy selfe, the things of the Church, thou be guiltie of great sinne. It is written: give unto Caesar, that which is Caesars: and unto God, that which is Gods. It is therefore neyther lawfull for us, (that be Bishops), to hold a kingdom on earth, neyther hast thou power (ô Prince) over sacrifices, and sacred things. Howbeit, these wordes doe onely distinguish, and put a difference betweene the office and function of Priests, and the office and function of Kings and Princes: shewing, that the one may not in-  
troch, or intrude upon that, which rightly, and properly  
belongeth

Athanas. ad so-  
larium vitam  
agentis.

belongeth unto the other, but that every one should keepe himselfe within the bounds of his owne proper calling & office. And so teach the Protestants also : and therefore if any King or Prince usurpe, or intrude upon that which is proper and peculiar unto the Priests office, ( as King *Vzziah* entred into the Temple, to burne Incense, which pertaineth to the Priests office onely,) they utterly dislike and condemne it. Now then let all this be granted, that Kings and Princes may not doe any thing that is proper and peculiar to the Priests office, nor may meddle in Ecclesiasticall causes, after a cruell and tyrannicall maner, nor use their authoritie in Ecclesiasticall causes, for the maintenance of *Arrianisme*, or of any other heresie or error, nor doe any thing against God, or his truth and Religion: Yet what doth all this, or any of this, make against those Godly and Christian Kings, and Princes, that extend and use their authoritie in Ecclesiasticall causes, in a good sort, and for God, and for the maintenance of his trueth, Religion, and ordinances ? It maketh, as you see, just nothing at all against them.

But it is further objected, that *S. Ambrose*, when *Valentinian* the Emperor would have had a Church in *Milan*, for the *Arrian* heretickes, answereth thus. Neyther is it lawfull for me to yeelde unto it, nor expedient for you *Emperor*, to take it. The house of a private man, you cannot by right invade : Doe you thinke then, you may take away the house of God ? It is alledged, that the Emperor may doe what he list : But I answer, burthen not your selfe, *o Emperor*, to thinke that you have any *Imperiall* right over those things, that be Gods. Exalt not your selfe so high, but if you will raigne long, be subject unto God. For it is written : give unto *Cesar* that which is *Cesars*, and to God, that which is Gods, Palaces belong to Emperors, Churches to Priests. The Church

2. Chron. 26. 16.  
17. 18.

Ambros. lib. 3.  
epist. 33.

Epist. 33.

Epist. 32.

Orat. eni. AUX-  
ent.

Ibidem Epist. 33.

Ambros. Epist.

Lib. 5. cont. AUX.

us Gods, it ought not to be yeelded by me to Caesar. The Temple of God cannot be Caesars right. I cannot deliver that to Heretickes, which I receaved to keepe on Gods behalfe. I would to God, it were apparant to me, that my Church should not be delivered to the Arrians, I would willingly offer my selfe to the judgement of your highnesse. I would to God that it were decreed, that no Arrian should trouble my Churches, and of my person pronounce, what sentence you will: With my consent, I will never forgoe my right, if I be compelled, I have no way to resist: I can sorrow, I can weepe, I can sigh: Teares are my weapons: Priests have onely these defences: By other meanes I neyther ought, nor may resist. To flie and forsake my Church I use not, least any should thinke it done, to avoyde some sorer punishment. If my goods be sought for, take them: If my bodie, I will be readie, Will you put mee in Irons, or lead mee to death? You shall doe me a pleasure, I will not guard my selfe with multitudes of people, but I will gladly be sacrificed for the Altars of God. All this maketh against the favourers and maintayners of Arrianisme, but nothing against that authoritie in Ecclesiasticall matters, which Kings and Princes have to commande, for God, and for the good of his Church, and the advancement of his Religion, against Arrianisme, and against all other heresies, and errors whatsoever. My Adversarie therefore objecteth further, that S. Ambrose saith: That a good Emperor is within the Church, and not above the Church. Indeepe, seeing the Church is the mother of Christian Emperors, aswell as of other Christians, it becommeth a Christian Emperor, as a good Child, and Sonne of such a mother, to account it his greatest honour, to submit himselfe, as he ought, to the word, rules, and ordinances, which God hath set in the same his Church, and not to exalt himselfe above them, as *Valentinian* did, when he was so forward for the advancement of Arrianisme



Arrianisme & Arrian assemblies, against the true Church of God, and the Orthodoxe Bishops therein. For, that, by the Church, here, S. *Ambrose* meaneth, the things of God in the Church, appeareth not only by that Text, which he citeth, of, *Give unto Caesar, the things that be Caesars, and unto God, the things that be Gods*, but by those other words of his likewise, where he saith plainly: *Ea qua divina sūt imperatoria potestati non esse subiecta: The things that be diuine, be not subject to the Emperors power.* And yet the same S. *Ambrose* affirmeth nevertheless, *That the Emperor had power over the persons of all men, within his Empyre:* Here then you must learne of S. *Ambrose*, to distinguish betweene the things in the Church, and the persons in the Church: For over all the persons, he confesseth, *That the Emperor had power: but, not over the Diuine things therein.* And this also doe the Protestants hold, that a Christian King hath power over the persons of all Bishops, Pastors, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers in the Church, within his owne Dominions: But not over the Diuine things therein, as namely, not over Gods Word, his Religion, Sacraments, and other his Institutions and Ordinances in his Church.

Yet againe it is objected by some, that S. *Ambrose* reproved the Emperor *Valentinian* the younger, for that he would take upon him to be Iudge in a matter of Faith, & cause Ecclesiasticall: but the reason of it must be knowne. For *Valentinian* a young Prince, not yet baptized, and a novice in the mysteries of Religion, would upon the perswasion and counsell of his Mother *Iustina*, an Arrian, needes have *Ambrose* to come, and dispute with *Auxentius* the Arrian, in his Palace or Consistorie before him: and he would be the Iudge, whether of their two Religions were truest. Whereunto *Ambrose* made answer, and gave it in writing to *Valentinian*, shewing him, amongst other things,

things, That he was young in yeares, a novice in Faith, not yet baptised, and that he was as yet rather to learne, then to judge of Bishops: That the Palace was no fit place for a Priest to dispute in, where the hearers should be Jewes, or Gentiles, and so scoffe at CHRIST: and the Emperor himselfe partiall, as appeared by the law published before that time, against the truth. *Auxentius*, (saith *Ambrose*,) being driven to his shifts, hath recourse to the craft of his forefathers, seeking to procure us envie by the Emperors name, saying: That he ought to be Iudge, though he be young, though he be not yet baptised, though he be ignorant of the holy Scriptures: and that in the Consistorie. And to the young Emperor himselfe, he spake thus: Your Father, a man of riper yeares, said, it is not for me to judge betweene Bishops: Doth then your clemencie at these yeares say, I ought to judge? He a man baptised in CHRIST, thought himselfe unable for the weight of so great a judgement. Doth then your Clemencie that hath not yet attayned to the Sacrament of Baptisme, challenge to judge of matters of Faith, when as yet you know not the mysteries of Faith, &c? In these words you see the reason, why *S. Ambrose* reprov'd *Valentinian*, & disliked, that he should challenge, or take upon him to judge in a matter of Faith, namely not for that he had not authoritie to deale in matters of Faith, and causes Ecclesiasticall, but in respect of other defects in him (*viz.*) For that he was so young, and as yet unbaptised, a Novice in the Faith, and ignorant in the Scriptures, &c. But then you will say, that even *Valentinian* the elder, the Father of this young *Valentinian*, did himselfe refuse, and dislike to judge in the same matter. But *S. Ambrose* likewise sheweth you the reason of it, namely because, *inhabilem se*, &c. He then thought himselfe unable to judge in so weightie a cause, The great question being, whether CHRIST was of the same substance

*Ibidem.*

*Idem lib. 5.  
Epist. 32.*

*Amb. lib. 5.  
Epist. 32.*

stance with the Father, yea, or no. Concerning which  
 question, when *Valentinian* was afterward better instru-  
 cted: then did he judge of the truth of it, and thereupon  
 by his Imperiall Authoritie, commanded it as a truth to  
 be preached: as appeareth evidently by the Epistle, which  
 he, and *Valens*, and *Gratian*, ( being then the Emperors, ) *Theodoret. lib. 4.*  
 wrote to the Bishops of *Asia*, *Phrygia*, *Cyrophrygia*, and *cap. 7. 8.*  
*Placaria*: wherein the Emperors write thus unto them:  
*After great disputation had to and fro, in a full Councell held*  
*at Illyria about our Saviour, those blessed Bishops have demon-*  
*stratively proved, That there is a consubstantiall Trinitie, The*  
*Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost: from which they*  
*would not depart one jot, but gave due reverence unto the*  
*Religion of the Almighty God: And we also, (say they,) by*  
*our Authoritie, have commanded the same to be preached. So*  
*that although Valentinian, at the first, & for a while, untill*  
*he were better instructed, would not; Yet afterward upon*  
*better instruction received, you see, that he did take upon*  
*him, to judge, that is, to discern, of the truth of that*  
*controversie, and by his Imperiall authoritie, as well as the*  
*other Emperors, commanded it as a truth to be preached.*  
*Theodosius* also, that Christian Emperor, ( whom *S. Am-*  
*brose* himselfe so much commendeth, ) judged of the truth  
 of the same controversie, betweene the *Homosians*, and  
 the *Arrians*: determining and appointing by a solemne  
 Edict, which of them should be accounted *Catholickes*,  
 and which *Heterickes*. For seeing the divisions and dis-  
 sentions that were then in the Church, he willed everie  
 sect to put their Faith in writing. There was a day pre-  
 fixed: The Bishops being called, met at the Emperors Pa-  
 lace. There came thither *Nectarius*, and *Agelins* for the *Ho-*  
*mosians*, *Demophilus* for the *Arrians*, *Eunomius* himselfe  
 for his followers; and *Elesius* for the *Macedonians*. When  
 they

*Socrat. lib. 3.*  
*cap. 10.*

they were come, the Prince admitted them to his presence : And taking the paper of each mans opinion, earnestly besought GOD, to helpe him in choosing the truth. Then reading their Confessions, hee rejected all the rest, as deviding and severing the Sacred TRINITY, and tore them in pieces, and onely approved and embraced the *Homousian* faith, and therewithall he made a law, that such as followed the Faith of the *Homousians*, that is, of such as beleevved CHRIST, to be of the same substance with the Father, and that beleevved one God-head of the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost, of equall Majestie in the sacred Trinitie, should be held and taken for Christian Catholickes, and the rest to be held infamous Heretickes. So likewise the Emperor *Gratian*, the Sonne of *Valentinian*, after that the Empyre came intirely to his hands, judged and condemned the *Arrian* heresie, and thereupon commanded the Preachers of that blasphemie, as wilde and savage beasts, to be driven from their Churches, and the good Pastors to be restored to their Churches againe : And the execution of this law he committed to *Sapores*, a famous Captaine of that time. In like maner, did *Theodosius* the younger also, judge and decree against the *Nestorian* heresie, that they which followed the wicked faith of *Nestorius*, or cleaved to his unlawfull doctrine, if they were Bishops, or Cleargie men, they should be cast out of their Churches, and if they were Lay-men, they should be excommunicate. And doth not moreover *Sozomen* record in a certaine case, That the Emperor commanded, That ten Bishops of the East, and ten Bishops of the West, chosen by the Councell, should repaire to the Court, and open unto him the Decrees of the Councell, that he might further determine and conclude what were best to be done. Yea *S. Augustine* himselte, expostulating this matter with the

*Cod lib. 1. tit. 1.  
de summa Tri-  
nitatis, & fide ca-  
tholica §. conclus.*

*Theodor. li. 5. c. 2*

*Evagrius lib. 1.  
cap. 15.*

*Sozomen lib. 4.  
cap. 16.*

*Aug. cont. epist.  
Parrin. lib. 1. c. 7.*



the Donatists, saith thus unto them: *Is it not lawfull for the Emperor to give sentence in a matter of religion? Why then went your messengers to the Emperor? Why made they him judge of their cause?* By these premisses then it is very apparant, That although none may be judge of Faith, and Religion, if you speake and meane, of an absolute, infallible, soveraigne, and supreme Judge, but God onely: Yet if you take judging, for discerning, (as often, and usually it is,) then not onely Christian Kings, and Emperors, but even all Lay Christians also whatsoever, by the tenor of the Scriptures, may and ought, so farre forth as they shall be able, to judge, that is, to discerne, of the doctrines of men, whether they be true or false: as is more at large declared in the Preface of my former Booke. Shall any then be so absurd, or unreasonable, as to denie this right of judging, that is, of discerning of the truth in the doctrines of men, to Christian Emperors, Kings and Princes, which is allowed to farre inferior and meaner persons? Yea, these chiefly and principally, in regard of their high places and callings, are to be allowed this right.

Whereas therefore my Adversarie saith, that Bishops, and Cleargie men, should be Judges for determining of Dogmaticall questions, and Controversies of Faith and Religion, and that Christian Emperors, Kings, and Princes, are to be guided, directed, taught, and instructed by them: all this is granted: Yet, withall, let Christian Kings and Princes have also, herein, their dues, and that right which to them belongeth: Which is, to search the Scriptures, thereby to trie & examine, whether the doctrine of their Teachers, be true or false: For, *It becometh the Hea-* A7 17. 11  
*vers,* (saith S. Basil,) *that be instructed in the Scriptures,* Basil.  
*to trie those things which are spoken by their Teachers, and recei-* Eshic. def.  
*ving that which agreeth with the Scriptures, to reject the con-* 77 pag. 432.

Aug. in Iohan.  
macl 45.

trarie; And so S. *Augustine* likewise, *Sua vero si velint docere, nolite audire, nolite facere, That if they will teach their owne divises, you must neyther heare them, nor doe as they teach you.* Although then, Bishops, Pastors, & Ministers Ecclesiasticall, are first of all to be consulted with, & to judge of matters of Faith, & controversies in Religion, yet are they not absolute and infallible Iudges, nor absolute and infallible Teachers, or directors, but are themselves limited, and to be directed, in all their Judgements, Doctrines, and Decrees, by that onely absolute and infallible rule of truth, the sacred and Canonick Scriptures. So that if they shall judge, direct, decree, or teach any thing not according to the Divine Scriptures, but contrarie thereunto, (as the Arrian Bishops in time past did, and as the Popish Bishops and Teachers, in these dayes doe,) all that is justly worthy to be refused, by all Christian Emperors, Kings, and Princes, as is verie evident, both by all good reason, and by that which is before delivered.

Now then, although, these two points be granted to my Adversarie, (*viz.*) That the Regall and Priestly offices be things distinct: and that those that beare Regall Authority, be also subordinate and subject, to that Authority, message, and Ministerie, which God hath committed to Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers Ecclesiasticall: yet when there is further, a third point appearing, which he must acknowledge, namely, that Bishops, Pastors, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers, be also subordinate and subject to the sword, and Authority of Christian Kings, and Princes, and that in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Religion, as well as in matters Civill and Temporall, (as is before at large declared.) What benefite or advantage doth he get thereby: Yea, is not his cause thereby for ever overthrowen?

Thus

Thus farre then you see, that the plea which hee hath put in for a demurrer, or stay of mens judgements, is altogether insufficient for that purpose: and therefore for any matter yet shewed by him, or appearing to the contrarie, all mens judgements, may and ought to proceede, and to be given against him and his cause, unlesse in that which followeth, he can shew better matter, then as yet he hath shewed. Let us therefore now see, whether hee hath any better matter in that, then he hath found in those his two points before mentioned. For those his two former points appeare not worth a poynt, nor of any value, or validitie at all against the Kings SUPREMACIE.

4 First, it is true, that I alledged that Text of 1. Pet. 2. 13. To prove the KINGS SUPREMACIE over all persons, as well Ecclesiasticall as Civill, within his owne Dominions. And what can my Adversary say against it? Doth not S. Peter expressly require of all Christians that live within the Dominion of any King, *That they should submit themselves unto him as unto  $\chi\rho\upsilon\iota$ , unto the Chiefe, or Supreme person over them?* 1. Pet. 2. 13. Hee cavilleth at my argument, because it is thus propounded interrogatively, and not affirmatively. A verie childish exception, if it be not more then childish: For, is he so sillie and ignorant, that he knoweth not, that an interrogative speech, doth sometime carrie the force of the greater, & more Emphaticall affirmati~~on~~? And yet if hee had but read, and remembered the verie next words following that interrogative, he might have found a redditive, and a direct affirmative answer thereunto. For the words next and immediately following, bee these: It is evident, ( say I, ) that he calleth the King Chiefe, or Supreme, not onely in respect of Dukes, Earles, or other Temporall governors, ( as the Rhemists would have it ), but in respect of all the

rest likewise, were they Bishops, Pastors, Cleargie men, or whosoever: For he writeth that his Epistle, not to Heathens, but to Christians: and amongst them, not to the Lay people onely, but to such also as were Presbiters, and

1. Pet. 1. 1. 2. 3. 4.

5. &c.

1. Pet. 5. 1. 2.

did ~~in his words~~, doe the office of Bishops amongst them, requiring even them, as well as the rest, to yeelde their subjection & submission unto him. Now then seeing this direct affirmative in my Booke, (pag. 1. of that Chapter,) and that the words of S. Peter, in the Text it selfe, be also directly affirmative, (for these be his words, *Be yee therefore subject, &c.*) What doth he, or can he answer there-  
unto? He still cavilleth, at the words of the Text, playing with them *ad libitum*, and maketh the reason of it to be,

1. Pet. 2. 13.

because he is a Lawyer: as though it were lawfull, or allowable for a man of that profession, to be a wrangling Lawyer: or as though, because he is a Lawyer, it were as free for him, to cavill, and sport himselfe, with Divine Texts and evidences, as with humane: or as though he had never heard, nor learned, That *Non est bonum ludere cum Sanctis*. Seeing I am a Lawyer, (saith he,) let me article and make my argument, or plea upon the Text: And then hee goeth on, and saith, That these wordes in the Text, (*Be subject,*) doe no more specific the Christians, then the Heathens, nor any more the Subjects, then the Princes. Be not these strange asseverations? For when S. Peter writeth that his Epistle, not to Heathens, but to Christians, *dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia, and Bithinia*, and saith thus unto them, *Subiecti estote, Be yee subject*: Can these words, thus directly, and purposely spoken to Christians, no more specific or intend Christians, then Heathens? Where were the mans wits, I mervaille, when he wrot thus absurdly? Yea, himselfe afterward confuteth himselfe: For mentioning

1. Pet. 1. 2. 3. 4.

&c.



tioning both this Text of S. Peter, and that also of S. Paul in Rom. 13. 1. &c. He saith, that in these two cited places, both these Apostles *Exhort to obedience*: and the reason, (saith he,) why the King is mentioned, *is, because in those dayes Christians, were by the malice of their Adversaries, accused of sedition, and rebellion against Princes.* Doth hee not by these wordes, make it verie evident, that S. Peter, in saying, *Subiecti estote, Be yee subject*, distinguisheth the Christians to whom he writeth, from the rest that were their adversaries, and were heathens, and Infidels? But why doth he say againe; that these words, *Subiecti estote, Be yee subject*, doe no more specifie Subjects, then Princes? For is it not a senselesse thing, to say, or suppose, when men are by expresse wordes exhorted, to be subject to their Kings and Princes, that these wordes should require no more of Subjects, then they doe of Kings and Princes? Yea, when he requireth Christians to be *subject to everie humane creature, whether it be to the king, as being the chiefe, or, unto governours, as unto them that are sent of him, for the punishment of evill doers, and for the prayse of them that doe well*: doth he not by this his distribution of the humane creature, apparantly shew, that, he meaneth thereby the King, as Chiefe or Supreme, and the other Temporal Magistrates, Rulers, or Governours, that be appointed or allowed under him? Little reason therefore had my Adversarie to say, *That by every humane creature, in the Text*, (thus distinguished by the Apostle himselfe, into the King as Chiefe or Supreme, and into others, that be Rulers, or Governours, under him,) *The King is no more comprised, then the Pope*: For, you see, that the King is directly comprised and intended, yea expressely named, and so is not the Pope. And this is so evident, that even the Rhemists themselves, doe likewise so teach and expound

1. Pet. 1. 13. 14.

Rhem. Annot. 5.  
in 1. Pet. 2. 13.

it, namely, *That by everie humane creature, in this Text, S. Peter meaneth the Temporall Magistrates.* Howbeit, hee calleth not Kings and Princes, and other inferior Magistrates under them, an humane creation, as though they were not also a Divine creation, and of Gods institution, (*For there is no power but of God.* Rom. 13. 1. 2. Ioh. 19. 11.) But they are called an humane creation, in respect, that the externall forme and maner of their creation, is usually such, as that God hath beene pleased to allow men to ordayne and appoint it, for the use, behoofe and benefit of men. For touching Kings and Princes, some are so by election; and some by birth and dilcent of inheritance: and concerning interior Magistrates, under Kings & Princes, they be also created and made, some after one sort, and some after another. But what forme of creation soever they receave from men, yet when they are once so appointed, they are then to be obeyed, *ἀπαρὰ τὸν ὑψίον, Propter Dominū, for the Lords sake,* (as S. Peter here teacheth,) to shew that they be also Gods ordinance, and of his approbation. And therefore doth S. Paul likewise teach; *That Christians must be subject to them, not onely for feare, or for wrath, but also for conscience sake, as being also Gods owne institution.* But my Adversarie at last confesseth, that this part of the Text, *Whether it be to the King, as excelling, or to Rulers as sent by him, with a reference to the precedent wordes, doth establish in the King, the Regall and Temporall Supremacie.* And this is enough, if he would be constant and stand to his wordes. For no other Supremacie, or Authoritie, in matters Ecclesiasticall, doth the King claime, but that which is Regall and Temporall. In as much as he claimeeth not to punish any offenders, in Ecclesiasticall causes, otherwise then by finings, imprisonments, and such like Civill, and Temporall penalties, and punishments,

1. Pet. 2. 13.

Rom. 13. 1. 2. 3. 4  
5.

punishments, which belong to that his Regall and Temporall Authoritie to inflict : and in asmuch as hee also meddleth not with preaching the Word, Ministring the Sacraments, Excommunication, Absolution, or whatsoever else that is proper and peculiar to the Bishops or Ministers function. And seeing he is so equall and just, as to denie Cleargie men, nothing that of right belongeth to them : Why should any Cleargie men, or any men whatsoever, be so unequall and unjust, as to denie unto him any thing that is his proper due, as namely a Regall and Temporall Power and Authoritie, to be extended, and used against offenders, in matters Ecclesiasticall, as well as in Civill ? For what ? Shall offenders in causes Ecclesiasticall, that be and persist wilfull, obstinate, and perpetuall contemners of al Divine admonitions, Church censures, and Christian courses, be held, not fit to be restrained, or punished Civilly, or by Temporall Authoritie ? Would not such a libertie, and impunitie, prove extremely and intollerably mischievous ? And yet must such a mischief be endured, or at least hazarded, where Ecclesiasticall Authoritie is contemned and set at naught, and that withall such contemners shal neverthelesse not be permitted to be restrained by the Civill Sword, and Authoritie of Kings and Princes. This argument I alledged in the first Chapter of my former Booke, (*pag. 6.*) but my Adversarie is of such an excellent skill, as that he can tell how to passe it over, as he doth many things more, without making any answer thereunto. Wherefore that his evasion and distinction, (which is likewise the common evasion and distinction of all the Papists,) *viz.* that Kings and Princes, are to be obeyed, when they command for matters Civill and Temporall, but not when they command for God, and his Religion, or in matters Ecclesiasticall, appeareth

appeareth to be a most false & most idle distinction, being both in my former Booke, and in this also, (much more largely,) refuted and confuted. Yea, it is so grosse and absurd, as that at the very first hearing of it, in this sort produced, it sheweth it selfe to be verie senselesse, and ridiculous. For, shall the King be obeyed, when he commandeth for men? and shall he not be obeyed, when he commandeth for God? Is not this to preferre Men before God, Earth before Heaven, the Bodie before the Soule, the Common-weale before the Church, and things worldly, terrestriall, and externall, before things divine, celestiall, and eternall? As for that which the *Rhemists* say, *That this Text giveth no more to any Prince, then may and ought to be done and granted to an heathen Magistrate*: it maketh not for them, but against them. For if they will grant no more to Christian Kings and Princes, then is due to heathen Princes, yet, even so much sufficeth, as touching this point, if it be well considered: Because, it is verie cleare, that even heathen Kings and Princes, are and ought to bee obeyed, when they command for God, his service & Religion: as is evident, by *Cyrus*, King of *Persia*, who though he were an heathen King, gave commandement to build the Temple in *Ierusalem*, and was therein obeyed: *Darius* also, another heathen King, gave commandement for the continuing of the building of that Temple, and for the Sacrifices to be offered in it, and was therein obeyed: In like sort, did *Artaxerxes*, though an heathen King, give commandement for the reforming of the Church according to the law of God, by the Ministerie of *Ezra*, that learned Scribe. *Nebuchadnezzar* also, though an heathen King, gave a commandement, and made a decree, that none should blaspheme the G O D of *Shadrach*, *Mes- shach*, and *Abednego*. King *Darius* likewise gave com- mandement

*Rhem. Annot 6*  
in 1. Pet. 2. 13.

*Ezra 1. 1. 2. 3.*  
C.

*Ezra 4. 6. 1. 3. 3.*  
C.

*Ezra 4. 7. 12. 13.*  
C.

*Dan. 3. 29.*

*Dan 6. 25. 26.*



mandement & made a decree, that in all the Dominions of his kingdom, men should tremble & feare before the Lord God of *Daniel*, whose god was the true god. Some heathē Emperors also gave commandment, that men should cease from persecuting the Christians, & that Christians should have the free exercise of their Religion, build Oratories, & places for their meetings and assemblies, & quietly possesse them, for the service of their God. Were not these & such like commandments, good, lawfull, & cōmendable, though given by heathen Emperors, and in causes Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Religion? And were they not meete to be obeyed? If then heathen Kings, and Princes, may, (as is manifest,) lawfully and laudably command for God, his worship, service, and Religion, and are therein dutifully to be obeyed, By what right or reason, can it bee denied to Christian Kings, and Princes, to have (at least) the like authority, to command in matters Ecclesiasticall, for God, his service, and Religion? For, shall Christian Kings and Princes, be in worse case then heathen Kings? Or shall they fare the worse, or have the lesse Regall power, and authority, because of their Religion of Christianitie? God forbid. This argument I likewise alledged in the first Chapter of my former Booke (*pag. 2.*) whereto my Adversarie againe, like a wise man still knoweth, how to answer nothing. And yet he saith, *he will propose my defused argument in a succinet forme, the most for my advantage*: But I neyther desire, nor looke for any advantage at his hands: Let him make his owne Arguments the best hee can for his owne advantage: As for mine, I would not have him to frame them, unlesse hee would doe it more truly. Hee would indeede, make my Argument defused, or rather confused, by his confused maner of answering, jumbling things together which I had Methodi-

*Enseb. li. 7. cap. 3.  
cap. 12.*

*Enseb. lib. 9. cap.  
16. cap. 8. lat.*

thodically, and expressly distinguished. For, first, my purpose was to prove his Majesties SUPREMACIE, over all persons, within his owne Dominions: and then afterward in the second place, to shew his Authoritie in respect of *Causes Ecclesiasticall*, aswell as *Civill*. In the first Section of that Chapter, *pag. 1. 2. 3. 4.* I handle the first point, concerning his Supremacie, in respect of persons: and in the second section *pag. 5.* and not before, it is, that I begin to handle his Authoritie in respect of causes. This Text then of *S. Peter*, being alledged, (as it is), in the first section, and *pag. 1.* was by me produced, to prove onely his Majesties Supremacie over all persons, aswell Ecclesiasticall as *Civill*, within his owne Dominions, and not for any such end, or purpose, as thereby to prove his Majesties Authoritie in causes *Ecclesiasticall*, aswell as *Civill*, as he misconceaveth. But sith he will needes have it so used, I am well content with it: because that Text, doth indeede serve verie sufficiently, to prove both those purposes. For the first, the argument is verie apparant, and may be framed thus. If all persons aswell Ecclesiasticall, as *Civill*, are to be subject to their King, as to the Chiefe or Supreme within his owne Dominions, then hath their King a cleare Supremacie over them all: But all persons aswell Ecclesiasticall, as *Civill*, are to be subject to their King, as to the Chiefe or Supreme, within his owne Dominions, (for so *S. Peter* directly teacheth:) Ergo their King hath a cleare Supremacie over them all. And for the second point, the argument is also very open, and evident: For the King is not called the Chiefe, or Supreme, in respect onely of the excellencie of his person above all his subjects, but in respect also of his Authoritie, Rule, and Government, he hath over them: yea in this respect specially, he is so called, as appeareth by this, That *S. Peter* di-

stri-

tributes the humane creature, he there speaketh of, that is, the Temporall Magistrates, Rulers, or Governors, into the King, as being the Chiefe or Supreme Governor, and into other, that be governors under him. So that here we finde, the Kings Title of Supreme Governor, very manifestly proved, and directly ratified, and confirmed. And that his government, and authoritie extendeth also to all manner of causes, (and consequently to causes Ecclesiasticall aswell, as Civill,) it is thus also made verie apparent, out of this Text. For S. Peter here sheweth, that the King as the Supreme Governor, and the other that bee inferior governors under him, be all constituted to this end, (*viz.*) *For the punishment of evill doers, and for the prayse of them that doe well.* Now, be there not, or may there not be, evill doers, aswell in the Church, as in the Commonweale, and transgressors, and offenders, aswell in matters Ecclesiasticall, as Civill and Temporall? Shall not then aswell the one sort of these offenders, as the other, be held punishable, by the Kings Civill, and Temporall Sword, especially when they grow and continue obstinate, wilfull, perverse, and unruly, and will not otherwise be re-laymed? The Text maketh no such difference, or distinction, (as the Papists fondly doe,) betweene offenders in causes Ecclesiasticall, and offenders in causes Civill, and Temporall, but generally or indefinitely, it would have *Evill doers*, of what sort soever, without any distinction, exception, or restriction, to bee punished by this Civill sword. And *ubi lex non distinguit, ibi nec nos distinguere debemus.* The Argument then for the Kings Authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, aswell as in Civill, out of this Text of S. Peter, is and may be framed thus. Whosoever hath authoritie from God, to punish *Evill doers*, by the Civill sword, without any distinction, restriction, or ex-

1. Pet. 2. 13. 14.

ception of causes; hath Authoritie in causes Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill: But the King hath Authoritie from God, to punish *Evill-doers* by the Civill sword, without any distinction, restriction, or exception of causes: *Ergo*, The King hath Authoritie in causes Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill. The *Major* is evident in it selfe: The *Minor* is proved, and apparant by the Text: and therefore the conclusion must be granted.

My Adversarie neverthelesse still urgeth, that as touching spirituall and Ecclesiasticall causes and matters, and concerning Religion, obedience must be performed to the Supreme Pastor, and head of the Church. And who denieth this? Yea, this is granted unto him, so hee take it rightly: For not the Pope, (as he and other Papists strangely suppose,) but *CHRIST IESV* sonely, is the Chiefe Shepheard, or Supreme Pastor, and head of the Church, as hath beene often declared, and as is apparant. As for that he saith, *That the Militant Church, must have some visible head in Earth to rule and governe it*: He onely saith it, but doth not prove it: and it is indeede, but an humane devise and conceit, and such as is before confuted in my former Booke, pag. 95. 96. 97. whereunto he still maketh no answer. And yet it is there shewed, that the Compagnie, both Militant, and Triumphant, make but one body, and one Church, unto *CHRIST IESV*, whereof he is the Head: and that though in his bodily presence and humanitie, hee be in heaven; yet by his Deitie, and power of his Spirit, and word, he is in Earth with his Church, and can tell, how to rule, governe, comfort, confirme, guide, and direct it, and to give all giftes and graces requisite, and to doe and performe all the offices of an Head unto it, much better then the Pope of *Rome*, or any man mortall whosoever: Yea, himselfe confuteth him-  
selfe,

1. Pet. 5. 4.  
Hebr. 13. 20.  
Colos. 1. 18.  
Ephes. 1. 22. 23.



selfe, when he saith, that in these words of CHRIST;  
*Reddite quæ sunt Cæsari, Cæsari: & quæ sunt Dei, Deo:* By  
 this word; *Cæsari*, is understood, (saith he,) *The Supreme*  
*Governor in Temporall affaires:* and by the word *Deo*, *the*  
*Supreme Governor in Spirituall affaires.* For, thereupon, it  
 followeth, that then is not the Pope of *Rome*, the su-  
 preme governor in those spirituall and Ecclesiasticall af-  
 faires, unlesse he will say, that the Pope is God. But  
 whereas he maketh *Cæsar*, or the Emperor, to be the su-  
 preme Governour in Temporall affayres onely, as though  
 he had no Authoritie in spirituall, or Ecclesiasticall mat-  
 ters also, therein is still his error; because it is before most  
 manifestly proved, that even the heathen Emperors, (and  
 much more those that were Christian Emperors) lawfully  
 might, & did cōmand for God his service, & Religion; &  
 dealt in matters Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill & Temporal-  
 l. Yea, *Rex est persona mixta*, as our law also calleth him,  
 in respect of that his interest & Authoritie in causes both  
 Ecclesiasticall, & Civill. For which cause likewise, amongst  
 Divines, he is said to bee, *Custos utriusque Tabulæ*.

As for that his calumnious speech, against *Luther* and  
*Calvine*, which he here also inserteth, as though they wrote  
 against the obedience due to Princes and their lawes; it  
 hath beene often answered by sundrie Protestants, and the  
 untruth of it, is so notorious, as, that the workes and wri-  
 tings of them both, doe shew, and openly proclayme the  
 contrarie to the world: if men would please to read them,  
 and not to wrest their wordes, but to take them, everie  
 where, in a right sense. But what meaneth he by this, that  
 he saith: *Kings and Princes, may more confidently build the*  
*safetie of their persons & estates, upon the loyaltie of their Ca-*  
*tholicke subjects; then upon any Protestant subjects?* what, are  
 Papists (whom he calleth Catholicks), more loyall to Pro-

*Luther tom. 1. in*  
*Genes. cap. 9. &*  
*tom 3. Annot. in*  
*Deut. 6. fol. 40.*  
*& tom 2. respon-*  
*ed Amb. Catho-*  
*ricum fol 150.*  
*& 152. &c.*  
*Calvin Inst. lib.*  
*4. cap 20. & in*  
*Rom 13. &c.*

restant Kings, and Princes, then Protestants? Is there any  
 likelihood of trueth, in this? Or doth he thinke, that Pro-  
 testant Kings and Princes, will or can be so perswaded?  
 For is it possible, that they, who for love or affection to  
 the Pope, and Popish Religion, denie and oppugne the  
 Kings SUPREMACIE, and the true Christian RE-  
 LIGION, he professeth, and defendeth, can be more  
 loyall or better subjects unto him, then those that acknow-  
 ledge his SUPREMACIE, & RELIGION by his  
 Authoritie established? Thankefully, and joyfully embrac-  
 ing them both, praying unto God for the continuance  
 of them, and for all maner of happinesse and prosperitie  
 upon him and his, which is the defendor and maintayner  
 of them both amongst us, and thinke themselves bound  
 in duetie and conscience so to doe? Comparisons, they  
 say, are odious, and therefore I could have wished that he  
 had forborne them, neyther needed he to have used them:  
 For, if wee all, both Protestants and Papists, bee in all  
 respects, and at all times, sound, faithfull, true, and good  
 Subjects to his Majestie, as of right & duetie we all ought,  
 and as I hope, we all shall be; I doubt not but it will suf-  
 fice, although we strive not thus to provoke one another,  
 by Comparative, or Superlative termes. But what reason  
 hath he further, to call *Calvine*, (as he doth,) *the sensuall  
 Libertine of this age*, who wrote against the libertines, and  
 against all licentiousnesse, and all manner of ungodlinesse,  
 and impietie whatsoever? For so his many learned, la-  
 borious, godly, and worthy workes, doe abundantly re-  
 stifie and declare to the world? Will Papists never cease  
 their malicious, and untrue accusations against *Luther*,  
*Calvine*, *Beza*, and other Protestants?

s The second Text I alledged, to prove the Kings Su-  
 premacie, over all persons, Ecclesiasticall aswell as Civill,  
 within

within his owne Dominions, is taken out of S. Paul, in Rom. 13. where S. Paul saith thus. *Let everie Soule be sub-* Rom. 13. 1. 2.  
*ject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God: and* 3. 4. 5. 6. &c.  
*the powers that be, be ordained of God: Whosoever therefore*  
*resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they*  
*that resist, shall receive to themselves condemnation. For Ma-*  
*gistrates are not to bee feared for good workes, but for evill.*  
*Wilt thou then be without feare of the power? Doe well:*  
*So, shalt thou have prayse for the same: For, he is the Mi-*  
*nister of God unto thee, for thy good: but if you doe evill,*  
*feare; For he beareth not the Sword in vaine; For he is*  
*the Minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon*  
*him that doth evill. Wherefore yee must be subject, not onely*  
*because of wrath, but also for conscience sake: And for this*  
*cause, pay yee tribute also: For they are Gods Ministers, im-*  
*ploying themselves, for that very purpose. By the higher*  
*powers, ( in this Text ), whereto subjection is required, &*  
*which beare the sword, for the punishment of the evill*  
*doers, and for the prayse of them that doe well, is meant,* 1. Pet. 2. 13. 14.  
*( as S. Peter also hath before shewed ), those that be Kings,*  
*Princes, and such like Civill and Temporall Magistrates.*  
*And this is so evident, as that though my Adversary doth*  
*not, yet the Rhemists doe ingeniously confesse, and teach* Rhem. Annot. in  
*it. For, That the Apostle meaneth here, specially of Tempo-* Rom. 13. ver. 4.  
*rall powers, we may see, ( say they, ) by the sword, tribute and*  
*externall compulsion, he here attributeth to them. Neyther*  
*was there then, ( as they say, ) any doubt conceived by Chri-*  
*stian men, whether they should obey their Spirituall powers, or*  
*Spirituall Governors, yea or no: which is another reason,*  
*they therigive to shew, that this Text is not to bee ex-*  
*pounded of Spirituall, but of Civill and temporall Rulers* Origen, in hunc  
*and Magistrates. Origen likewise declareth the same, affir-* locum.  
*ming them to be, Non Antistites, & Principes Ecclesia-*  
*rum,*

rum; sed Mundi iudices, & seculi potestates, Not Bishops, and Prelates of Churches, but worldly Iudges, and secular Powers.

*Ambrosius in hunc locum.*

*Aug. de Catech. rudibus cap. 21.*

*Lib. 2. dist. 44.*

*Aquinas in hunc locum.*

*Aug. contr. epist. Parmen. li. 1. c. 7.*

In like sort S. *Ambrose* affirmeth them to be Reges, & seculi rectores, Kings and secular Governors. S. *Augustine* also saith, that hereby is taught, Ecclesiam Christi in omnibus sanctis eius, servitutam esse, sub Regibus seculi: That the Church of Christ in all his Saints, must serve under the Kings of this world. The M. of the Sentences likewise saith: that the Apostle speaketh of Princes, and such like. *Aquinas* also doth interpret them, to be, Potestates terrenas, & carnales Dominos, Terrestriall powers, and temporall Governors. S. *Augustine* againe, in another place, yet more fully declareth the same. What credit then is to be given to mine Adversarie, when contrarie to the testimonie of all these, and contrarie also to the testimonie of the Rhemists, and contrarie also to the cleare evidence of the Text it selfe, he saith, That in these higher Powers, is no more included the Temporall, then the Spirituall Powers? Yea, S. *Chrysostome* also yet further sheweth that Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists and such like Ecclesiasticall Ministers, are to be reckoned in the number of those Soules, that are to bee subject to the higher powers; and therefore can none of them, (no, not the Bishop of Rome himselfe,) be comprised or intended under the name of the higher Powers, there mentioned. S. *Chrysostomes* wordes be these: Let everie Soule be subject to the higher Powers: Yea, though you be an Apostle, though an Evangelist, though a Prophet, Sive quisquis tandem fueris, &c. Or whosoever you be. My Adversarie is so captious, as that because in my former Booke, pag. 2. cap. 1. there is an, &c. after these wordes in Latin, Quisquis tandem fueris: hee would make his Reader beleieve, that there is some abstruse meaning in that Enigmaticall clause, (as he calleth it,) which if I would unfold, would declare, how little

*Chrysost. in Rom. homie 23.*



little it made for my purpose: But, why doth not himselfe unfold that *anigma*? Is it, because *Darius est, non Oedipus*? For if himselfe had read the place in *Chrysostome* (as it seemeth he did not) he might easily have unfolded the *anigma*, & discovered the fallacy or deceit, if any had lyen inclosed, or hidden in it. But my selfe did indeed sufficiently unfold it, in the verie same place (pag. 2.) where, after that (&c.) I added out of *Chrysostome*, that which I meant by that (&c.) namely, these words, *Neque enim pietas subvertitur ista subiectio*, For neyther doth this subjection overthrow pietie or godlinesse. The whole clause and sentence then, (that being also added, which was intended by the &c.) is this: (*viz.*) Let everie Soule be subject to the Higher powers: Yea, though you be an Apostle, though an Evangelist, though a Prophet, or whosoever you be: For neyther doth this subjection overthrow pietie or godlinesse. Now he hath it wholly & intirely unfolded: What can he make of it, eyther to advantage himselfe, or to disadvantage mee? Yea, this unfolding & expressing of it, rather maketh for me, because it directly affirmeth, that this subjection (of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, & all other Ministers Ecclesiasticall,) To these Higher powers, standeth well with Christian Religion, and doth no way subvert, or overthrow any part of pietie or godlinesse. Wherefore, S. *Chrysostome* saith there yet further: that, *Omnibus ista precipiuntur, Sacerdotibus quoque non Monachis, & non solum secularibus*: These things be commanded to all, even to the Priests also, and to Monicks, and not to secular-men onely. I likewise alledged, (in that first Chapter of my Booke, (pag. 2. & 3.) *Theodoret*, *Theophilact*, *Oecumenius*, *Aeneas Silvius*, *Gregory*, and *Bernard*: who all declare (as well as *Chrysostome*), that even Bishops, Priests and Cleargie-men, and not Secular or Lay-men onely, be in the number of those Soules, that are to be

*Theodoret. Theophil. & Oecumenius in Rom. 13. Bernard. Epist. 41. Greg. Epist. li. 3. Epist. 62. & 65. Paris 1605.*

*Aeneas Silvius*  
lib. 1. de Gestis  
Basil. Concil.

*Optat. contr. Par-*  
*men. lib. 3.*

*Tertul. ad Scil-*  
*pul. cap. 2.*

*Tert. Apolog.*  
*cap. 6.*

*Chrysost. ad po-*  
*pul. Antioch. ho-*  
*mil. 2.*

subject to these higher Powers: In somuch that *Aeneas Silvius*, (who was himselfe, sometime a Pope of Rome,) affirmeth, that *S. Paul* saith: *Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit: nec excipit animam Papa.* Let everie Soule be subject to the higher Powers: Neither, (saith he,) doth *S. Paul* here except the soule of the Pope himselfe, but that he also ought to be subject. And for further prooffe hereof, I alledged also the testimonie, of *Optatus*, who saith: that *super Imperatorem non est nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem*: Above the Emperor, is not any, but God onely that made the Emperor. I cited also the testimonie of *Tertullian*, writing thus: *Colimus Imperatorem, ut hominem à Deo secundum, & solo Deo minorem.* We Christians doe honour the Emperor, as the man next unto God, & inferior onely unto God. Agreeably whereunto he saith againe of the Emperors, that they be under the power of God onely, *à quo sunt secundi, post quem primi*: from whom they be the second, after whom they be the first. And (pag. 30.) I alledged the testimonie, once more, of *S. Chrysostome*, who saith of the Christian Emperor in his time: that *Non habet parem super terram*: He hath no peere or equall upon earth. Yea, he saith further of him, that hee was, *Summus & caput omnium super terras hominum*, The head, and one that had the supremacie over all men upon earth. To all which, my Adversarie, according to his wonted, wise, and learned manner of answering, thought it best to answer nothing. Thus farre then have I proved against him, that by the higher powers, in this Text of *S. Paul*, be meant Emperors, Kings, Princes, & such like temporall Magistrates: and that by everie Soule in this Text, which is to be subject to the higher Powers, is meant, all manner of persons whatsoever, Ecclesiasticall, aswell as Civill and Temporall; and consequently, that the Bishop of Rome, was then clearly

clearly subject to the Emperour of Rome, and so ought still to have continued. But my Adversary at last granteth, That Bishops, Priests, and Cleargie-men, be subject to the King, and to his Lawes; but with this distinction, namely, according to the directive power of them, but not according to the coactive. And this distinction he learned not onely of Suarez, but of Bellarmine also: For thus likewise writeth Bellarmine. *Non sunt amplius Reges, Clericorum superiores, & proinde non tenentur iure divino, nec humano, eis parere, nisi quantum ad leges directivas.* Kings are not any longer Soveraignes or superiors to Cleargie-men, and therefore are they not bound to obey them by Gods Law, or Mans law, unlesse it be in respect of lawes directive. What Bellarmine meaneth by lawes directive, himselfe declareth when he saith, That Princes have no coactive power over the Cleargie-men, but onely power directive. This distinction was not knowne in the Apostolicke, Primitive, and ancient Church, nor so long as the Bishops of Rome were subject to the Emperors; but when the Bishops of Rome, contrarie to all lawes, both humane, and divine, had trayterously and wickedly subdued the Emperors; and that it could be said of Emperors and Kings as Bellarmine speaketh, that, *Non sunt amplius Clericorum superiores*, They are no longer Soveraignes or superiors to Cleargie-men: Then did this distinction arise or grow, that the Kings might have a directive power, but no coactive power over the, that is, might direct them to whar was good, but might not compell the to it. And so saith also mine Adversarie, that coactive power imposeth penalties. Now this distinction is easily answered and confuted, yea he might have perceived it in my former Booke (pag. 7. 8. 9. 10.) to have beene sufficiently answered and confuted. For besides other proofes, it is there shewed by diverse testimonies out of S. Augustine him-

Bellar. de Clericis cap 28.

Aug. lib. 1. in fine contr. Episc. Parmen.

Aug. lib. 1. in fine contr. Episc. Parmen.

selfe against the *Donatists*; That Kings and Princes may not only direct or command, but may also by Lawes, penalties and punishments, compell their Subjects, ( and consequently *Cleargie-men*, aswell as others, ) to obedience in that which is good and godly. Yea, it is the proper and peculiar right of Kings and Princes, externally to use a power coactive, by reason of the sword committed to them from God: which, Ecclesiasticall Ministers, by verue of their Ecclesiasticall calling and office, cannot doe. And seeing Parents have a power coactive over their children, and Masters in a familie over their servants: verie strange it were, if Kings should not be allowed to have a power coactive over their subjects. But it is indeede verie well knowne, that the Christian Emperors in ancient time, did use a power coactive, even over *Cleargie-men*, aswell as over others, inflicting penalties and punishments upon them. As for example: *Constantine* that Christian Emperor, exiled and banished *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognius* Bishop of *Nice*: and hee saith further:

*Theoderet. lib. 1.  
cap. 20.*

That if any man (whether Bishop, or other) were offended, at that his banishing of them, and would grow malepart thereupon, *Illius statim audacia, Ministri Dei, hoc est mea executione coercetur*: His boldnesse shall forthwith be repressed, by the execution of Gods minister, that is, of my selfe. Another *Constantine* also, (by whose Imperiall Authoritie, the sixth Councell at Constantinople was held, in a Decree inserted in that Councell), saith: *Siquidem Episcopus est, vel Clericus, vel Monachico circumdatus habitu, deportationis panam exsolvet*: If he be a Bishop, or a Clarke, or a Moncke, let him be punished with deportation or banishment. *Charles*

*Synod. 6. A. 11. 18  
Conc. edit. Bin 10  
p. 92.*

*Tom 2. Concil.*

Mayne also in a French Synode, decreed imprisonment: *Si ordinatus Presbiter fuerit, duos annos in carcere permaneat*. *S. Augustine* againe declareth, that there was a Law

*Aug. lib. 1. in fine  
contra epist. Par.*

*Impe-*



Imperiall against those that professed themselves Christians and true Catholickes, and yet were not so, but kept private Conventicles, ~~and~~ that he that ordained a Clarke for that purpose, or the Clarke so ordained, should loose ten pounds of gold: and the place also where such Conventicles were kept, should be forfeited to the Emperor. You see then (for the refelling and overthrowe of that foolish and false distinction), that the Christian Emperors had power coactive, over Bishops, and Cleargie-men, punishing them sometime with deportation, exile, or banishment: sometime, with imprisonment: and sometime with penalties, and losses of summes of money, and other forfeitures. And upon some kinde of offenders, you may read, that they inflicted the punishment of death. And indeede to what end, hath the King this Regall and Temporall Authoritie & jurisdiction, & the power coactive in his hands by reason of the Sword committed to him from God, if hee may not use it, and put it in execution? Yea my Adversarie himselve confesseth, and saith, that *iurisdictio nullius wideretur esse momenti, si coercionem aliquam non haberet*: jurisdiction might seeme to be of no regard, if it had not some coercion, or power coactive joyned with it. Againe, (he saith:) *Cui iurisdictio data est, ea quoque concessa intelliguntur, sine quibus iurisdictio expleri non potest*: To whom jurisdiction is given, all those things be also understood to be granted, without which that jurisdiction cannot be performed. Wherefore, even by those Maximes, which himselve citeth and approveth, it is manifest; that seeing the King hath a power, jurisdiction, and Authoritie, to direct & command Cleargie-men, he hath also a power coercitive, or coactive over them, to compell, correct, and punish them, if otherwise they will not obcy those his directions and commandements. So that my Adversarie needed to have no bet-

ter confuter of this his idle distinction then himselfe.

But *pag. 5.* in that first Chapter of my former Booke, I alledged that Text of *Rom. 13.* to prove also the Kings Authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, aswell as Civill or Temporall. And indeede this Text serveth also verie sufficiently for that purpose. For as there is here no exception of any person, so is there also no exception of anie cause or matter: but whosoever doth evill, be it in what kinde of cause soever, he is here made subject to this sword and Temporall Authoritie of Emperors, Kings and Princes: For the Text saith, *That they are the ordinance of God, and the Ministers of God,* (attending, employed, and constituted to this verie end and purpose,) *for the prayse, countenancing, and encouraging of the good and wel-doers, and for discountenancing, discouraging, and punishing of the bad, and such as be evill-doers.* And therefore doth S. Augustine

*Aug. Epist. 50.*

say: that *Quicumque legibus Imperatorum, quæ pro Dei veritate feruntur, obtemperare non vult, grande acquiri supplicium: Whosoever will not obey the Lawes of the Emperor, which are made for the trueth of God, doth purchase to himselfe a great punishment.* For, (saith he in another place,)

*Aug. Epist. 166.*

*Hoc jubent Imperatores, quod jubet & Christus: quia cum jubent bonum, per illos non jubet nisi Christus: The Emperors command that which Christ also commandeth: because when they command that which is good, it is Christ himselfe that commandeth by them.* Yea S. Augustine was so farre from this point of Poperie, to denie, or disallow the Authoritie of Emperors, Kings and Princes in matters Ecclesiasticall and concerning Religion, as that he doth evermore teach, and defend it, whensoever there was occasion to speake of it, in somuch that he saith: *Imperatores salutes dicimus, si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maxime dilatan-*

*Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 5, cap. 24*

*dum, &c. We affirme the Emperors to be happie, if they ex-*

*tend*

send their Authoritie the most they can, to doe service unto God, in the spreading of his Religion. For, (as the same S. Augustine againe saith,) a King serveth God one way; as he is a man: and another way, as he is a King: As a Man he serveth God by living well and faithfully: But as he is a King, he serveth God by setting forth Lawes, to command that which is good, and to remove the contrarie. So that Kings, as Kings, serve God, in doing that for his service, which none but Kings can doe. Wherefore my Argument to prove the Authoritie of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, in both those points together, out of this Text of *Rom. 13.* is this: whosoever hath Authoritie to punish evill-doers, without exception of any person, and without exception of any cause, hath Authoritie over all persons, and in all causes aswell Ecclesiasticall as Civill: But the Emperor within his Empyre, and the King within his Kingdomes, hath Authoritie to punish evill-doers without exception of any person, and without exception of any cause, (as is apparant by the Text it selfe, wherein no exception is to be found.) Ergo, the Emperour within his Empyre, and the King within his kingdomes, hath authoritie over all persons, and in all causes, aswell Ecclesiasticall as Civill.

6 But now from this Text of *Rom. 13.* alledged in the 5. pag. of that first Chapter in my Booke, concerning the SUPREMACIE: My Adversarie commeth next to the point of *Appeales*; mentioned in the same first Chapter, pag. 24. So, that he here skippeth over 9. whole leaves together at one leape: and I must follow him in his course. It is true, that (in the pag. 24.) I said, that when *Cecilianus* Bishop of *Carthage*, was accused by *Donatus*, & some other of that faction, *Constantine* the Emperor commanded *Cecilianus* to come to *Rome*, with a certaine number of Bishops that accused him: and by his Commission, (extant  
in

in *Eusebius*,) authorized and appointed *Miltiades*, the then Bishop of *Rome* & some others with him, for the hearing and ending of that matter. These Commissioners condemned *Donatus*, who appealed from their sentence, to the Emperor: which appeale also, the Emperor received. Where, beside that you see, that this Christian Emperor made Commissioners in this Episcopall and Ecclesiastical cause, observe withall, that *Miltiades* the then Bishop of *Rome*, was one of those Commissioners, and there withall you may also note, that the Bishops of *Rome*, were then verie clearly subject and not superior to the Emperor. So that a Christian King, or Prince, not onely may make Commissioners in Ecclesiasticall causes; but may also have *Appeales* made unto him, as is here apparant. To this my Adversariemaketh divers answers. *First*, (he saith,) *that this instance concerning Appeales, maketh more against me, then for me, because it was an Appeale made by Hereticks, (viz.) the Donatists, unto the Emperor.* But this reason of his, maketh more against him, then for him. For if it were lawfull for Heretickes, who thought themselves wronged by the inferior Iudges, to appeale to the Emperor: no lesse (if not much more lawfull was it) for the Orthodoxe Bishops if they were wronged, to appeale to him. And if *Constantine*, that Orthodoxe, godly and Christian Emperor, thought it lawfull for him, (as hee did, for otherwise hee would never have meddled with it,) to entertaine, and receive an appeale made to him from Heretickes: much more would hee have thought it lawfull and meete to receive *Appeales* from such as were Orthodoxe, right & true Christians, and men, for Faith & Religion, like himselfe. But that he may know, that not onely heretickes, but Orthodoxe Bishops also, did appeale to the Emperor: Let him take for an evident prooffe of it, the example of *Athanasius*, and



and of the other Bishops joyned with him, who, (as is before shewed, ) appealed from the Councell of *Tyrrus*, Secret lib. 1. cap. 33. & 34. unto the same godly Emperor *Constantine*: which appeale the same Emperor likewise received. Neyther would *Athanasius*, nor any other good and godly Bishops have appealed unto him, if they had not thought it lawfull, both for them so to doe, and for the Emperor also to receive such appeales. Neyther did the *Donatists* appeale onely from *Miltiades* the Bishop of *Rome*, and those that were joyned with him by Commission from the Emperor: But, they appealed also from those other Bishops, that were afterward assembled at *Arle* in *France*, for the hearing, and ending of the same cause. And both these *Appeales* did the Emperor receive, and upon the last appeale, he sate himselfe in person, and gave Iudgement for *Cacilianus*, against the *Donatists*: whose proceedings and Iudgements upon those appeales, *S. Augustine* disliked not, but well liked and allowed: alledging them, as being substantiall proofes for the Catholickes, and lawfull, good, and effectuall judgements against the *Donatists*. I grant that *Constantine* was loth at the first, to be Iudge in this Episcopall cause, in his owne person, and therefore *S. Augustine* saith: *Eam discutiendam atque finiendam, Episcopis delegavit*, He delegated, and appointed Bishops to discusse and determine it, namely, *Miltiades* and his Colleagues. Aug. Epist. 166 And when *Miltiades* and his Colleagues had pronounced *Cacilianus* innocent, and condemned *Donatus*, as Author of the schisme rayled at *Carthage*: Your side, (saith *S. Augustine* to the *Donatists*, ) came hacketo the ibidem. Emperor, and complayned of the judgement of the Bishops against them: The most patient and milde Emperor, the second time gave them other Iudges, namely, the Bishops that met at *Arle* in *France*: And your men, (saith

Idem Epist. 162

Aug. Epist. 166.

he, speaking still to the *Donatists*,) appealed from the Bishops of *Arle* also, to the Emperors owne person; and never left, till the Emperor himselfe in person tooke the hearing of the cause betweene them: which he did, and, upon hearing it, pronounced *Cacilianus* innocent, and those his accusers, to be malicious wranglers. Againe, the same S. *Augustine* saith: that the *Donatists* appealed from Ecclesiasticall judgement, to the end that *Constantine* might heare the cause: Whither, when they came, both parties standing before him, *Cacilianus* was adjudged to be innocent, and the *Donatists* overthrowne. To prove this I will further bring you, (saith S. *Augustine*), the very wordes of *Constantine*, where he witnesseth, That upon judiciall bearing of both sides, he found *Cacilianus* to be cleare. Yea, S. *Augustine* sheweth further, what followed upon this judgement. Then did *Constantine*, (saith he), make a sharpe law, to punish the *Donatists*: his sonnes continued the same. Reade, what *Valentinian*, reade, when you will, what *Gratian*, and *Theodosius*, Decreed, against you. Why wonder you then, at the Children of *Theodosius*, as if they had followed any other president in this cause, then the judgement of *Constantine*, which so many Christian Emperors have kept inviolate? Though *Constantine* bee dead, yet the judgement of *Constantine*, given against you, liveth. For, when Emperors command that which is good, it is Christ and no man else that commandeth by them. Thus you see how much this judgement of *Constantine* upon this *Appeale*, made to him, (though by *Donatists*), was not onely justified and approved by S. *Augustine*, but embraced also by other Christian Emperors, as *Vertuow*, and confirmed as Religious, and honoured of the whole Orthodox Church in that time. So little cause hath mine Adversarie, or any other Papists, to mislike of *Constantine* his  
med-

meddling therein, as if it were unlawfull. But, secondly, my Adversarie answereth, that the then Emperor *Constantine the Great*, did remit *Cacilianus* and the *Donatists*, for the decision and determining of their difference, unto *Miltiades* Bishop of *Rome*, as to his proper and right Iudge. It is true, that he committed the hearing and determining of that cause unto *Miltiades* Bishop of *Rome*, but not to him alone, as if he were the sole and onely proper, and rightfull Iudge, in the case, but to him together with others. For, *Marcus*, *Rheticus*, *Maternus*, and *Marinus*, were interested with him in the same Commission. The Commission is yet extant in *Eusebius*, to be seene in these words. *Constantine the Emperor*, unto *Miltiades* Bishop of *Rome*, and to *Marcus*, sendeth greeting: For asmuch as many such Epistles are brought unto mee from *Anilinus* Lieutenant of *Africke*, wherein it is said, that *Cacilianus* Bishop of *Carthage* is reprehended in many things, by divers of his Colleagues abiding in *Africke*: and this seemeth unto me very grievous, that there should be found in those Provinces, which the providence of God hath allotted peculiarly unto my government, a great multitude of people prone unto the worse, and disagreeing: And that amongst Bishops, there should be such variance. My pleasure therefore is, that *Cacilianus* with ten Bishops of his accusers, and ten other of his favourers, doe come to *Rome*, there to be heard before you both, joyning with you, *Rheticus*, *Maternus*, and *Marinus*, your Colleagues, whom purposely for that matter I have commanded with speed to repaire thither unto you, &c. And *S. Augustine* likewise hath before told you, that the Emperor committed this cause, *Non Episcopo sed Episcopis*, Not to one Bishop in the Singular number, but to Bishops in the Plurall number: *eam discutendam atque finendam Episcopis delegavit*. And againe he saith: *Causam Cacilianijunxit: eum audiendam*, &c. else where he also saith,

Euseb. li. 10. 1. 5

Aug. Epist. 166.

Collet. 3. diei cum  
Donatistis cap. 3

*Idem Epist. 166* *Constantinum dedisse Iudices iterum, That Constantine gave them Iudges a second time.* And hee further proveth that those Iudges, both the first and second, might lawfully judge in that case, *Eo quod Imperator illos Iudices dedisset, Because the Emperor had given those Iudges.* So that it appeareth very fully and clearely, that not *Miltiades* alone, as Bishop of *Rome*, and in his owne right, but *Miltiades* associated and joyned with others, namely, with *Marcus, Rheticius, Maternus* and *Marinus*, were the Iudges in this case, and that by Commission and Authoritie granted from the Emperor. Yea, you see, there was afterward also an *Appeale* from their sentence, to the Emperor, whereupon the Emperor a second time, gave other Iudges, from these also, <sup>and</sup> there a second *Appeale*, to the Emperor himselfe in person: who, at the last, in his owne person, heard and judged the cause, and without the Bishop of *Rome*, by his owne authoritie, pronounced finall sentence therein. The least of these facts proveth the Emperors Supremacie in those times, as well over the Bishop of *Rome*, as over other Bishops: What force then have they, when they be all united and joyned together?

Yet thirdly, my Adversarie answereth, that *Constantine the Emperor* did but pronounce and declare the justnesse of the sentence given formerly against the *Donatists*, by their competent Iudge, *Pope Miltiades*. But first, why doth he still say, That the sentence against the *Donatists*, was given by *Miltiades*, as though it had beene given onely by him? For it is manifest that it was not only his sentence and judgement, but the sentence and judgement of the rest of his Colleagues and fellow Commissioners joyned with him. Secondly, why doth he speake of *Miltiades* Bishop of *Rome*, as if he were the onely competent Iudge, when he not onely seeth others to be joyned, and made Iudges with him,

but



but an *Appeale* also to be made and allowed from his and their sentence, and from other Iudges also afterward given to Iudge of the same cause. And thirdly, though *Constantine* the Emperor, did by this sentence, upon hearing of the cause, cleare and acquite *Cacilianus*, and condemne the *Donatists*, and so approved the first sentence, and judgement given by *Miltiades* and his Colleagues, and the second sentence also that was given by the other Bishops assembled at *Arle* in *France*: Yet doth this approbation of his, or declaration of the Bishop of *Romes* sentence in this case to be just and right, no more prove a supremacy in *Miltiades* the Bishop of *Rome*, then it doth in *Marcus*, *Rheticus*, *Maternus*, and *Marinus*, or then it doth in those other Bishops that were afterward assembled at *Arle*, whose sentence he likewise approved, and declared to be just. Neyther doth it any way impayre or detract from *Constantine* his judgement, but that hee was also a Iudge, and held the place and office of Iudicature, all this notwithstanding. For else may you say, that those Bishops assembled at *Arle*, (whom *S. Augustine* expressly calleth *Iudices*, *Iudges*), were also no Iudges, because they likewise, as well as *Constantine*, acquitted *Cacilianus*, and condemned the *Donatists*, and so approved the sentence of *Miltiades*, and his Colleagues declaring it to be just. If a Writt of Error be brought in the Kings bench, of a Iudgement given in the Common-pleas, & upon hearing of the cause, the Iudges in the Kings Bench approve and confirme the judgement formerly given in the Common-pleas, and so declare it to be just and right: Doth this any way prove that therefore those in the Kings bench be no Iudges, or doth it in any sort detract from their Authoritie? So upon the *Appeale* made to the Emperor, when he in his own person, saie, as Iudge therein, having power in himselfe,

eyther to affirme or disaffirme the former sentences and judgements given by others, as he <sup>may</sup> find the cause upon hearing to require: If he upon hearing it, finding the former sentences and judgements given for *Cacilianus* against the *Donatists* to be iust and right, doth by his final sentence pronounce and declare them so to be: Doth this therefore prove him to be no Iudge, or doth it any way detract from his supremacie? Yea it doth rather verie strongly, and most strongly prove the Emperor to bee a Iudge, and the Chiefest and highest Iudge under God, and to have the Supremacie over the Bishop of *Rome* as well as over other Bishops within the precincts of the Empyre. For, as *Cacerius* also confesseith and teacheth, *Summum Imperium penes eum esse constat, ad cuius Tribunal provocatur*: It is manifest that to him belongeth the Supremacie, to whose Tribunall the appeale is made.

*Cacer. de potest.  
Rom. Pont. lib. 1.  
cap. 10.*

But my Adversarie saith yet further, that *Appeales* to Emperors and Kings, were alwayes in Temporall matters, but therein he is also much deceived. For *Appeales* were made to them sometimes in matters Ecclesiasticall: as even this very particular *Appeale*, here made to the Emperor in the cause betweene *Cacilianus*, and the *Donatists*, doth plainly declare. For *Donatus* and his partakers objected, that *Cacilianus* could not be Bishop of *Carthage*, for many crimes surmised against him, and especially, for that *Felix* which imposed hands on him, had, (as they said), betrayed or burnt the Scriptures. Whereupon they not only refused his Communion, but procured also his condemnation in a Provinciaall Synod by 1xx. *African* Bishops, and in a tumult erected another Bishop. So that the great Question in this cause was, whether *Cacilianus* thus accused and ordayned by the imposition of hands of *Felix*, and condemned by that Provinciaall Synod in *Africke*, were the

the right Bishop of *Carthage*, or he that was erected by the *Donatists*: Which, what is it else, but a matter Ecclesiasticall? For, the parties accusing, and accused, were Ecclesiasticall, namely, Bishops; the crimes and faults objected, were objected as just impediments to the Episcopall dignitie; the things surmised, and to be tried, were the right election of Bishops, the lawfull deposing of them, the needfull Communion with them, the schismaticall dissenting from them. What causes can be more Ecclesiasticall then these? And yet even in this Episcopall and Ecclesiasticall cause, was there (as before appeareth) an *Appeale* made to the Emperor, accepted by him, approved by sundry Emperors, and allowed also by *S. Augustine*, and the whole Orthodoxe Church in that time. That famous *Appeale* also from the Councell of *Tyrus*, to the Emperor, by *Athanasius*, and other Orthodoxe Bishops ioyning with him, was it not likewise in a matter Ecclesiasticall? For the crimes objected against them, were these, (*viz.*) *Overthrowing the Lords Table, dashing in pieces the Mysticall Cup, burning the holy Bible, using a dead mans hand to sorcerie, &c.* The *appeale* also which *S. Paul* himselfe made from the high Priest and Councell of the *Jewes*, unto *Cesar*, was it not also in a cause Ecclesiasticall? For, were not the matters for which *S. Paul* was accused, matters Ecclesiasticall? *Festus* himselfe witnesseth, that *Pauls* accusers brought no crime against him of such matters as he supposed, but had certaine questions against him, of their owne superstition, and of one *Iesus*, that was dead, whom *Paul* affirmed to be alive. And this, even *S. Paul* also himselfe declareth in his answer, when he saith thus unto them: *Why should it be thought a thing incredible unto you, that God should raise againe the dead?* And so also wrote *Claudius Lysias* unto *Felix* the governor, that when *Paul* was brought before the

*Socras lib. 1. cap. 27. after the Greeke, &c. 20. in Latin. Act. 25. 10. 11.*

*Act. 25. 18. 19.*

*Act. 26. 8.*

*Act. 23. 28. 29.*

the Councell of the Jewes, *There I perceaved*, (saith hee), *that Paul was accused of questions of their Law, but had no crime against him worthy of death, or bonds.* Yea, *S. Paul* saith againe expressely thus: *Of the resurrection of the dead it is, that I am accused of you this day.* It is therefore very

*Act. 24. 20. 21.* apparant, that *S. Pauls* appeale from them to the Emperor, was in and concerning a matter Ecclesiasticall. And it (which is a thing evident), *S. Paul* in a cause Ecclesiasticall and concerning Religion, thought it lawfull and meete for him, to appeale to the Emperor when hee was an heathen, much more would hee have thought it lawfull and meete to *Appeale* to the Emperor being a Christian. For though an heathen Emperor hath in him the power and authoritie to receave such an appeale: yet upon such an appeale in a cause Ecclesiasticall and concerning Religion, is he not so well able to judge of the cause in respect of skill and knowledge, as he that is a Christian Emperor. And herein doth also that reverend and renowned Bishop *Athanasius*, speake thus unto the Emperour of his time.

*Athanasius, ad consp. Apolog.*

*Si apud alios accusatus essem, ad tuam Majestatem provocarem: quemadmodum Apostolus dixit, Casarem appello, & cessatum est ab insidijs, contra eum. Iam quum apud te calumniam mihi ausi sunt intentare, ad quem, ~~ante~~ quaeso, appellare potero, nisi ad patrem ejus qui dixit, ego sum veritas?* If I were accused before others, I would appeale to your Majestie, as the Apostle said, I appeale to Caesar; and then was there no longer lying in wayte for him: but now that they are bold to calumniate me to your Majestie, to whom, I beseech you, may I appeale from you, unlesse it be to the Father of him that said, *I am the trueth*? In which wordes, he sheweth, that this fact, and example of the Apostle *Paul*, in the appealing to the Emperor, was to be imitated, and followed of Christians in after times, and that beyond the Emperor, there



there was also in those times of *Athanasius*, no appeale to be made but to God onely.

But here now my Adversarie goeth about by alledging *Appeales* to have beene made to the Bishop of *Rome*, to inferre a Supremacie to belong unto him: and for prooffe thereof, he citeth some examples, as namely: First, that of *Marcion*, who being excommunicate, went to *Rome* to be *Epiph. heres. 42.* absolved by the Bishop there, (as he alledgeth out of *Epiphanius*.): Howbeit, *Epiphanius* doth not say, that he desired this absolution of the Bishop of *Rome*, but of diverse plurally, namely, *ἁπλοῦς*. Secondly, *Epiphanius* sheweth, that these of the Church of *Rome*, in that time answered him, *That they might not receive or absolve him, without the consent or permission of his Reverend Father, the Bishop, that had excommunicated him.* And thirdly against this course of running to *Rome*, it was afterwards purposefully decreed in the Councell of *Nice*, *That they that were ex-* *Cons. Nic. l. 1. c. 9.* *communicate by one Bishop, should not be absolved of another.* Wherefore all this maketh much against the Supremacie of the Bishop of *Rome*, but nothing for him. His second example is of *Fortunatus* and *Felix*, who being wicked men & excommunicate in *Africke*, fled to *Rome*, to be absolved there by *Cornelius* the Bishop of *Rome*. And for prooffe hereof, he citeth *S. Cyprian*: But doth *S. Cyprian* allow of this their flying to *Rome*? No: but cleane contrariwise he utterly misliketh, and condemneth it. For, writing to the same *Cornelius*, he saith, *That certaine persons condemned in Africke by the Bishops there, Roman cum* *mendaciorū suorū merce navigaverunt, Sayled to Rome with their fraite of lyes:* And against this hee addeth further, *That it is a thing equall and right, that everie mans cause should be there heard, where the crime was committed.* Again he saith, *That every Pastor, hath a portion of the Lords flock*

assigned unto him, which he must governe and rule, as hee that must give an account of his doings unto God, and therefore concludeth, that *Oportet eos quibus præsumus, non circumcursare, &c.* Those that be under our rule and government, ought not to runne thus about (to Rome) but ought there to plead their cause, where they may finde both accusers and witnesses: unlesse perhaps, (saith he), a few desperate and loose Companions, suppose the authoritie of a Bishop of *Africke*, to be lesse then the authoritie of the Bishop of *Rome*: which hee speaks, as accounting it absurd, for any man to suppose, the Authoritie of the one, to be greater then the Authoritie of the other.

His third example is of *Athanasius*, who being deposed from his Bishopricke, made his appeale, (saith he), to Pope *Iulius*, and was by him restored. It is true, that *Athanasius*, the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, being oppressed, and wrongfully thrust from his Bishopricke, (as diverse other Bishops likewise were in those dayes), fled to the Bishop of *Rome*, not to acknowledge any supremacie in him over all other Bishops, as now he claymeth, but as to a friend, and Patron, at whose hands he expected and hoped, to finde some helpe and defence in that his distresse. The Bishops throughout the East, that favored the *Nicene Faith*, were (saith *Sozomen*), deposed, and the chiefeſt *Seates* invaded by the *Arrians*, as *Alexandria*, in *Egypt*; *Antioch* in *Syria*; the Royall Citie of *Constantinople*, in *Helleſpont*. This the Bishop of *Rome* and the Priests of the West, tooke to be their reproch, & therefore verie freely entertayned *Athanasius* at his comming to them, and tooke upon them the defence of his cause. Where you see, that *Athanasius* had ayde and defence, not onely of the Bishop of *Rome*, but of the Priests of <sup>of the West</sup> ~~Rome~~ also: wherefore that his flying to *Rome*, and receiving helpe and defence from them, doth no more prove a supremacie in the

*Sozomen, lib. 3.  
cap. 6. last.*

*Criminalionem  
illicebantam in  
se servabant.*

the Bishop of Rome, then it doth in the Priests of ~~Rome~~.

Yea, the letters which *Athanasius* brought with him to Rome, from the Bishops of his communion in the East, *Athan. Apolog. consta. Arrian.*

(witnessing the wrongs wch he suffered, and earnestly craving helpe therein), were not written to *Iulius* alone, but

*Omnibus ubique Ecclesia Catholica Episcopis, To all the Bishops of the Catholicke Church wheresoever.* And according-

ly was this matter heard and examined by a Synod, or Councell of Bishops: In which Synod, (and not by *Iulius*

alone), it was, that *Athanasius* was receaved and restored, as Bishop of *Alexandria*, notwithstanding his former de-

position. Neyther did *Iulius* the Bishop of Rome, call or summon this Councell, but by the commandement of both

the Emperors, (saith *Socrates*), (the one in the West, signifying the same by his letters, the other which ruled in the East, wil-

lingly condescending thereunto), there was proclaymed a generall Councell, that all should meete at *Sardica* a Citie of *Illiri-*

*cum, &c.* Yea so farre was *Iulius*, the Bishop of Rome in that time, from having any supremacie over all the Bi-

shops in Christendome, that when hee wrote to the Bishops of the East more freely and sharpely, and as if hee

tooke some authoritie upon him over them, (as they conceived), these Easterne Bishops assembled together in a

Councell at *Antioch*, formed an Epistle by uniforme consent of them all, wherein they inveigh bitterly against *Iu-*

*lius*, and tell him plainly, That if any were banished the Church, and excommunicate by their decree and censure, it

belonged not to him to intermeddle with it, nor to sit in judgement upon their Censure. So that howsoever the Bishops

of the East, and of the West, might and did give mutuall helpe, counsell, comfort, and assistance one to another, yet

if the Bishop of Rome would at any time goe beyond his bounds, and seeme to take authoritie over them; We see,

*Socrus. lib. 3. c. 11. lat.*

*Socrus. lib. 2. cap. 20. in the greeke*

*& cap. 16. in the latin.*

*Socrus. lib. 2. cap. 15. in the greeke*

*& cap. 11. in the latin.*

*Socrus. lib. 3. cap. 7. lat.*

that these Bishops of the East, would by no means endure it, but gave it the repulse.

The fourth and last example which he citeth, is that of S. Iohn Chrysostome, who being deposed from his Bishopricke, Appealed (as he saith) to Pope Innocentius the first. Bellarmine hath also this example, aswell as all the rest: so that, my Adversarie takeith indeede, all his weapons and artillarie, out of his store-house. But both Bellarmine, and He, doe but deceive their Readers. For Chrysostome, in his Epistle doth not pray ayde and helpe onely of Innocentius the Bishop of Rome, (as they suggest,) but of other Bishops likewise in the West, aswell as of him, speaking not in the Singular, but in the Plurall number, thus. *Domini igitur maxime venerandi & pij, cum hac ita se habere didiceritis, studium vestrum, & magnam diligentiam adhibete, quo retundatur hac, qua in Ecclesias irrupit iniquitas.* Therefore most religious and reverend Lords, since you see, how things be carried, extend your diligence, and endeavour, that this wickednesse which is broken into the Churches, may be beaten backe. Quippe, si mos hic invaluerit, scitote, quod brevi transibunt omnia. Quapropter, ne confusio hac, omnem, qua sub cælo est, nationem invadat, obsecro ut scribatis, ut hac tam inique facta, robur non habeant: Nobis vero, literis vestris & charitate vestra frui concedite. For if this grow to be a custome, know yee, that all things will shortly come to nought, and therefore least this confusion invade everie nation under heaven, I beseech you write, that those things so unjustly done, may beare no sway: And grant, that we the wronged Bishops of the East, may enjoy your letters and your favours. And so he goeth on, with Verbes of the Plurall number, to the end: concluding his Epistle with these words, and in this manner. *Hac omnia, cum ita se habere intellexeritis, à Dominis meis pientissimis nostris Episcopus:*

Chrysos. Epist. 1.  
ad Innocent.  
Tom. Conc. 1. edit  
Venet. 1585  
pag. 799.

obse.



*obsecro, ut præstetis id quod petent officij.* All these things when yee shall perceave to be true, by theſemy Lords and moſt godly breſhrens the Biſhops, I beſeech you to yeelde them, that aſſiſtance they ſhall deſire. All which claues in that Epistle, I thus the rather rehearſe, to the end, you may the better judge, whether it be not more fitly, and more coherently to be reade, *Obsecro ut ſcribatis*, in the Plurall number, (as the Proteſtants ſay it ought to be reade,) then *Obsecro ut ſcribas* in the Singular number, as *Bellarmino*, and other Papists following the faultie and vicious copies would have it. For when he ſpeaketh to his moſt Reverend and Religious Lords, the Biſhops in the *West*, were it not verie abſurd to ſay thus unto them, *Obsecro ut ſcribas*, but to ſay, *Obsecro ut ſcribatis*, is verie conſonant, and moſt fit, and congruous. Againe how can, *Obsecro ut ſcribas*, well ſtand with theſe words. *Literis vestris frui concedite?* or with *didiceritis, adhibete*, or, with *Scitote*, and *intellegeritis*, or with *præstetis*, or with all the reſt of the Verbes that be of the Plurall number. But let this be as it will; This is certaine, and cannot be denied, that *Chryſoſtome* prayed ayde aſwell of the other Biſhops of the *West*, as of *Innocentius* Biſhop of *Rome*, & of them all alike. So that this example, and times of *Chryſoſtome* & *Innocentius*, make nothing for the Biſhop of *Rome* his ſupremacie, but much againſt it: For when *Chryſoſtome* was depoſed from his Biſhopricke, in a Councell of Biſhops at *Calcedon*, hee appealed from them, not to the Biſhop of *Rome*, but to a generall Councell. This *Socrates* witneſſeth ſaying: *Iohannes, eos à quibus vocabatur, tanquam inimicos exceptione recusabat, & universalem Synodum appellabat*: Iohn *Chryſoſtome* reſuſed thoſe that called him to that Councell, upon this exception, that they were his enemies, and appealed to a generall Councell. Secondly, thoſe Biſhops aſſembled in that Councell, for the de-

*Socrat. lib. 6. cap. 15. in greek & cap. 14. in the lat*

*Ibidem.**Sozom. libr. 8.  
cap. 28.*

posing of *Chrysostome*, were so assembled, not by the commandement of the Bishop of *Rome*, but by the Emperors commandement: for so also doth *Socrates* testifie. Thirdly, when *Innocentius* saw, that the matter could not be ended but in a generall Councell, he sent Legats to *Honorius* and *Arcadius* Emperors, to beseech them to call a Councell, and to appoint the time and place for it: where also, his suite and supplication, was so little regarded; That his Legats were sent away with reproch, as, disturbers of the West Empyre, as *Sozomen* witnesseth. Now, if *Innocentius* Bishop of *Rome*, had had the power and authoritie in those times to call generall Councells, Why did hee not call them? Yea, why did he, by his Legats intreate and beseech the Emperors to doe it, if it were a right belonging to himselfe, or if it were not a right belonging to the Emperors in those dayes? Or, if he were then the supreme commander of all the Christian world (as the Popes now claime to be,) how commeth it to passe, that he was such an humble suiter to the Emperors for a Councell, and yet could not obtaine it? Doe not all these things, strongly and invincibly declare, that in those times, not the Popes, but the Emperors, had clearly the supremacie?

Then afterward, though much out of his due time and place, and very immethodically, ( for the exception had bene fitter in the next Chapter then in this,) hee taketh this exception, that in the first part of my Booke, *Cap. 2. and pag. 42.* in the Margent, there is a misquotation in this sort (viz.) *Bern. de conf. ad Eng. lib. 6. cap. 3. & 8.* where it should have bene; *Bern. de conf. ad Eng. lib. 4. cap. 2.* For, indeede in this place, it is, that *S. Bernard* calleth the Popes doctrines and pastures, *Demonum potius, quam ovium pastura*, which be the wordes I cited *S. Bernard* for, and which are accordingly, there, expressely, to be found. What a poore excep-

exception then is this, to carpe at a Quotation in the margin, when, the verie wordes, and matter, are there to be found, in the Author himselfe, whom I cited, namely, in *S. Bernard*? Is he not farre driven, that is, forced to this kinde of exception? And yet if hee had beene pleased to have looked into the *Errata* of my Booke, he might have found in the conclusion of them, that such like faults, as this, I desired the Reader to correct with his Pen, which he might very easily have done, if he had so pleased. But, as it seemeth, he is an hard man, that neyther out of his owne courtesie, nor yet upon the intreatie of others, will be moved to shew so small a kindenesse. What? Is it, because better matter sayled him, that he tooke this silly exception and standeth so much upon it? Or is it, because by this meanes, he loveth to declare himselfe to bee as voyde of good humanitie, as he is of true and sound divinitie? For my part: I may say, that he giveth me herein cause to joy and rejoyce, that hee can justly take no exception to the matter contayned in my Booke, but onely to a marginall Quotation, thus misprinted and mistaken.

Howbeit, hee seemeth yet further verie willing and forward, to carpe at these wordes in my Booke, *Cap. 1. pag. 25.* where I say, that in the time of King *William Rufus*, *Anselmus* the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, would have appealed to *Rome*, but not onely the King, but the Bishops also of *England*, were therein against him: but the truth of this, is verie cleare and apparant. For *Atalmesbury*, Malmsh. lib. v. (whom I there cite for prooofe hereof,) witnesseth, *That* de gestis Pont. Angl. both the King, disliked that his doing, and that therein also, *Omnes Episcopi Anglia*, *Primate sue suffragani negarunt*, All the Bishops in *England*, denied their voyces unto their Primare. Yea *Matthew Paris*. further testifieth, that when *Anselmus* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, asked leave of King Math. Paris. in Gulielmo 2. An. 1094.

*William*

Ibidem.

Ansel. Epist. 46.  
ad Paschalem li.  
3. Colon. 1612.

Matth. Paris. in  
Hen. 1. An. 1104

William Rufus to goe to Rome : The King replied, That no Archbishop nor Bishop of his Realme, should be subject to the Pope, or Court of Rome : especially for that he had all those rights in his kingdome, which the Emperor had in his Empire : And for this cause, was Anselmus Convented by the King, as an offender against the State. And to this accusation, did also the rest of the Bishops, except the Bishop of Rochester, give their consents. And because he ventured to goe over the Seas to Rome without leave : All his goods were seised to the Kings use, all his acts and proceedings in the Church of England reversed, and himselfe constrained to live in banishment during the life of King William, whereof Anselmus himselfe complained in his Epistle to Pope Paschalis. Yea afterward also, in the time of King Henry the first, when the same Anselmus was returning home from Rome, the Kings Atturney in his Masters name, forbad him to enter the Land, unlesse he would faithfully promise to keepe all the customes, both of ( William the Conqueror ) his Father, and of William Rufus his brother : And when the King perceived the Pope and the Archbishop, to continue their former purpose, against his Royall liberties, he seised the Bishopricke into his hands, and arrested all Anselmus goods, that were to bee found.

Matth. Paris. in  
Henrico secundo,  
Anno 1164.

To these and certaine other liberties of the Crowne, Did also King Henry the second, not long after, cause all his Bishops and Nobles to be sworne : For, in the yeare of our Lord God M. C. LXIIII. This King Henry the second, being at Claredon in the presence of the Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priors, Earles, Barons, and great Men of the Realme, there was made a rehearsall of some part of the Customes and liberties of his Auncestors, as of King Henry his Grand-father, and others, which ought to be kept in this Realme, and observed of all, &c. Amongst which customes and liberties,



ties, being sixteepe in Number, these were some, namely: That no Archbishop, Bishop, nor any other person of the Realme, may goe out of the Land without the Kings leave. And as touching appeales if any be made, they shall come from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, & from the Bishop to the Archbishop: And if the Archbishop sayle in doing justice, it shall be lawfull to come last of all to the King, that by his commandement the matter may be ended in the Archbishops Court. So that no man shall proceede to appeale any further without the Kings consent. These customes & liberties of the Crowne, the Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priors, and Cleargie with the Earles, Barons, and all the Nobles sware, and by word of mouth faithfully promised should be kept, and observed to the King, and his heires for ever, simply, without any fraud. Yea, Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury himselfe, condescended to them, & promised also with an Oath to keepe them: although afterward he revolved, and brake his Oath, and fled to Rome. But (saith mine Adversarie) The Pope of Rome, Alexander the third, would not confirme these lawes or liberties, though the King requested it. What of this? The liberties, lawes, and customes of the kingdome, were good enough without his confirmation. Yet the King perceaving his so just and reasonable a request, to be repelled by the Pope, was not a little offended thereat, and therefore wrote Letters to all his Shiriffes & Lieutenants in England, on this wise: I commande you that if any Cleargie-man, or Lay-man in your Countie, appeale to the Court of Rome, you attach him, and hold him in fast-ward, till our pleasures be knowne. And to his Iudges also he wrote in this sort. If any shall be found to bring letters or a mandate from the Pope, or from Thomas the Archbishop, interdicting the Realme of England: Let him be taken and kept in Prison, till I signifie what shall be done with him. They that wrote the

Mark. Paris.  
ibidem.

In quadrilog. de  
vita Thom. Cant.

Hoveden. Hist. 2

Math. Paris. in  
Men. 2. An. 1163

life of the same Thomas Becket, doe report it thus: Let him be forthwith apprehended for a Traytor, and execution done upon him: which agreeeth with that which likewise, ( pag. 25. cap. 1. of my Booke, ) I cited out of Hoveden, where he saith: that, *Si quis inventus fuerit, literas vel mandatum ferens Domini Papæ, &c. Capiatur, & de eo, sicut de Regis traditore, & regni, sine dilatione fiat justitia.* If any shall be found, bringing letters or a mandate from the Pope, let him be apprehended, and let justice be done upon him, without delay, as upon a traytor to the King and the kingdome. Where it is also further said, that, *Generaliter interdictum est, ne quis appellet ad Dominum Papam.* It was generally prohibited, that none should appeale to the Pope. Wherefore, you see, that which I wrote, concerning *Anselmus*, and concerning *Appeales*, to be verie true. Yea, how earnest and vehement, this valiant and worthy Prince, King Henry the second, was against the Pope, for maintenance of his Regall rights, appeareth further by an Epistle of his, written to the Archbishop of Colen, in these wordes. *I have long desired, ( saith he ), to finde a just occasion to depart from Pope Alexander, and his perfidious Cardinals, which presume to maintaine my Traytor, Thomas of Canterbury, against me. Whereupon, by the advise of my Barons, and Cleargie, I meane to send the Archbishop of Yorke, the Bishop of London, the Archdeacon of Poictiers, &c. to Rome: which shall publickly denounce, and plainly propose in my behalfe, and in the behalfe of all the Dominions I have, to Pope Alexander, and his Cardinals, that they maintayne my Traytor no longer, but rid me of him, that I with the advise of my Cleargie may set another in the Church of Canterbury. They shall also require them, to frustrate all that Becket hath done, and exact an Oath of the Pope, that he and his successors, as much as in them lieth, shall keepe and observe inviolable to me and all mine for ever,*

ever, the Royall customes of King Henry my Grand-father : If they refuse any of these my demaunds, neyther I nor my Barons, nor my Cleargie will yeelde them any kinde of obedience any longer : Yea rather we will openly oppugne the Pope, and all his : and whosoever in my land shall be found hereafter, to adhere to the Pope, shall be banished my Realme. Here then by the way, let me demaund, why any Papists doe call this *Thomas Becket* a martyr, whom the King calleth a traitor ? The manner of his death, being done by private violence, and not by publike authoritie, nor in a legall sort, I utterly dislike : But is not also his stout standing in that quarrell against his King, and against his owne oath also, and against the punishing of murtherers, theeves, and other malefactors by the Kings Lawes, ( if they were Cleargie-men, ) justly worthy to be condemned ? Or can he that dieth in and for so bad a cause, deserve to be called a martyr ? But such it seemeth, be the martyrs of the Popish Church.

But not onely these Kings of *England* before mentioned, namely, King *William Rufus*, King *Henry the first*, and King *Henry the second*, and some others, thus contended & opposed themselves against the Popes of *Rome*, for maintenance of their Regall rights, but King *William the Conqueror* also, who was before all these, <sup>much</sup> the like Kingly opposition. For, when *Hildebrand*, otherwise called, Pope *Gregory the seventh*, was bold to demaund of the King, an oath of fealtie to be made to him, as if the King were to hold his kingdome of him, as of his Sovereigne Lord. This King would by no meanes yeelde thereunto, but sent him a full negative answer, writing thus unto him : *Fidelitatem facere nolui, nec volo: quia nec ego promissi, nec antecessores meos, antecessoribus tuis, id fecisse comperio.* I neyther would doe, nor will doe fealtie, because I neyther

Ex Lanfranc. Epistolis. M. S. in Biblioth. Cotton. & Baron. Annal. 1079. §. 25.

*promised it, nor doe I finde, that any of my predecessors have done it to any of your predecessors. This answer of the King, is extant in an Epistle of his, written to the same Pope, which you may see set downe more at large by that excellent antiquarie and learned & godly divine, Doctor Vsher, late Lord Bishop of Meath, and the now most Reverend and worthy Lord Archbishop of Ardmagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland, in his Booke, De Christianarum Ecclesiarum successionē & statu, pag. 182. Neyther neede I to insist onely upon these former Kings of England. For doe but reade further, the Statutes of Provision, and Præmunire made in that kingdome, and thereby you may see at full, that many & sundrie other Kings of England likewise, and the whole Realme also concurring and joyning with them therein, have in severall Parliaments, made Lawes and Statutes against the Popes inroachments and usurpations, in maintenance and defence of their Regall rights, freedoms, and liberties. And among many other good reasons they shew for those their doings, this is not the least, that they say expressly in one of those Acts of Parliament, That the Crowne of England hath beene so free at all times, that it hath beene in subjection to no Realme, but immediately subject to God, and to none other, in all things touching the Regalltie of the same Crowne. And therefore doe they there utterly dislike in plaine tearmes, That it should be submitted to the Bishop of Rome. Wherefore it is apparant, that even the ancient Kings of England, long before the dayes of K. Henry the VIII. of famous memorie, have stood and contended, not onely for the freedome of the Crowne generally (not allowing it to be in subjection to any, but to God onely), but also in a particular sort, for divers their particular Regall rights, & liberties. Amongst which you may perceave this to be one, namely, that Ap-  
peales*

*See the Statutes  
of Provision and  
Præmunire in  
Rastall fol. 354.  
© c.*

*See this in the  
Statute of 26.  
Rich. 2. cap. 5.  
m. 10. d. 10.  
act. 1. d. 10.*



peales even in Ecclesiasticall causes, they would have to be determined within their owne kingdomes, and not to be made, transferred, or carried without their consent, to the Pope or Sea of Rome.

8 But now what meaneth mine Adversarie to be so extremely audacious, as to denie the first foure generall Councils to have beene called by the Emperors? Let therefore the Ecclesiasticall Historie shew and decide it. Touching the first generall Council at Nice: *Ruffinus* saith expressly, that *Constantinus apud urbem Nicenam Episcopale Concilium convocavit*: The Emperor Constantine, called the Council of Bishops together at the Citie of Nice. *Eusebius* that wrote the life of Constantine, saith, of that Emperor, that *Generalem Synodum congregavit*, He assembled the generall Council. *Socrates* saith likewise, that Constantine, *Synodum Oecumenicam congregavit, & omnes qui fuerunt undique Episcopos in Nicenam consuevire hortatus est*, Assembled a generall Council, and willed all the Bishops every where to meete at Nice. *Theodores* saith, that the Emperor, *celebre illa coegit Nicæa Synodum, &c.* Assembled that famous Council of Nice. *Sozomen* saith, that Constantine, *Indixit Concilium Nicæa, scripsitque ad omnes Ecclesiarum præsides, ut ad diem præstitutum adessent*. Summoned the Council of Nice, and wrote to all the Prelates of the Churches, to be there, at the day prefixed. And the same *Sozomen* saith, That hee sent his letters to the Apostolicke Seas: To *Macarius*, Bishop of Jerusalem, to *Eustatbius*, Bishop of Antioch: To *Alexander*, Bishop of Alexandria, and to *Iulius* Bishop of Rome: Who being an old man, and notable to come himselfe, hee sent in his stead, *Vitus* and *Vincentius*. The Nicene Fathers themselves, by their Synodall Epistle, (extant in *Theodoret*), which they wrote to the Church of Alexandria, doe testify: That they were assembled by the authoritie of the Em-

*Ruffinus*, li. 10. c. 1.

*Euseb. de vita Constant. l. 3. c. 6*  
& *lib. 1. cap. 37*

*Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8*  
in the greeke. &  
cap. 5. in the lat.

*Theodores. libr. 1*  
cap. 17.

*Soz. l. 1. c. 16.*  
lat.

*Theodores. lib. 1.*  
cap. 9.

peror Constantine. And if the Bishop of Rome had had the power and authoritie, to call the Councell, he would no doubt, being an old man, and not able to travell, have had it at Rome, or in some part of Italy, rather then at Nice in Bithinia, so farre remote from Rome. Nicephorus also saith, that *Imperator Nicanam Synodum promulgabat & literis locorum omnium Episcopos, ad constitutum diem eo evocavit:* The Emperor proclaymed the Councell at Nice, and by his letters called thither; the Bishops of all places to be there, at the day appointed. Zonaras saith: that *Imperator provinciarum Episcopos, Nicea Bithiniæ urbis, convenire iussit.* The Emperor commanded the Bishops of the Provinces, to meete together at Nice, a Citie in Bithinia. And Platina also writeth, that this generall Councell of Nice, was summoned or called *Constantini mandato, by the commandement of Constantine the Emperor.* It is therefore abundantly manifest, that this first generall Councell of Nice, was called, not by the authoritie of any Pope, but of the Emperor. How then, is it not an over great, if not a most intollerable impudencie in Papists, to denie so manifest, and palpable a truth? As touching that answer which Bellarmine and other Papists make, when they say, *That this Councell was called or summoned by the advise and consent of the Bishop of Rome.* First, Ruffinus saith, that it was assembled, or called, *Ex sacerdotum sententia, by the advise and consent of the Priests,* and not of the Bishop of Rome alone. Yea, Epiphanius saith, *That it was obtayned of the Emperor, at the suite of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria.* But secondly, it maketh no matter, at whose suite or request, or by whose advise or consent, the Councell was summoned: For the question is not, by whose perswasion or suite, or by whose advise or consent, but by whose authoritie it was called. Now it is verie apparant, that it was called and assembled,

by

Niceph. lib. 14

Zonaras.

Platina in vita  
Silvestri.

Ruffin. lib. 1. c. 1.

Epiphani. lib. 2.

Tom 2. heres. 68

by the authoritie and commandment, not of any Bishop of Rome, but of the Emperor.

The second generall Councell, ( which was the first Constantinopolitane,) was also called, not by Damasus Bishop of Rome, but by the Emperor Theodosius the elder. This is also evident: First, by Theodoret, who saith: *Hujus Theodor. li. 5. c. 7 rei gratia, Theodosius, Episcopus Constantinopoli congregari iussit: For this cause Theodosius commanded the Bishops to be assembled at Constantinople. Socrates and Sozomen likewise doe both testifie, that Theodosius summoned & assembled this Councell. Zonaras saith, that this second generall Councell was summoned Iussu Imperatoris, by the commandment of the Emperor: 150. godly fathers being there assembled. And the very Councell it selfe speaking to Theodosius, doe testifie the same, and say thus. Wee being assembled at Constantinople by the Letters of your Pietie.*

Socrat. lib. 5. ca. 8  
Soz. li. 7. c. 6. las.  
Zonaras in Theod.  
In dedicatoria  
ad Theodosium.

The third generall Councell, namely, the first Ephesine was also called, not by the authoritie & comādemēt of Celestinus Bishop of Rome, but by the Emperor Theodosius the younger. This is verie manifest, for Evagrius saith *Evagri lib. 1. c. 3. directly, That by the appointment, or command of Theodosius the younger, the first Ephesine Councell was assembled. Liberat. in hist. Liberatus likewise writeth, That the Emperor wrote to all de Concil. Ephes. Bishops, that they should assemble at Ephesus, to judge of the Bookes of Nestorius and Cyrillus: And in their Epistle to Epist. Synod. all the Bishops, thus writeth the Councell it selfe: Cum essemus Ephesi, secundum pias Imperatoris literas congregati: When we were at Ephesus assembled, according to the pious letters of the Emperor. Socrates also saith, that Imperatoris mandato, Episcopi ex omnibus locis Ephesum conveniunt: in the lat. & ca. The Bishops of all places, came together to Ephesus, by the com- 34. in the greek mandement of the Emperor. Zonaras saith: These things Zonar. in Theobeing knowne, Celestinus Bishop of Rome, Cyrillus Bishop of d. sio juniore.*

Alexandria,

Niceph. lib. 14.  
cap. 34.

Alexandria, Iohn Bishop of Antioch, and Iuvenall Bishop of Ierusalem, relate the matter to Theodosius the Emperor, and to Pulcheria the Empresse, desiring that he would summon a Councell, &c. Nicephorus also saith: Theodosius Imperialis literis, in Metropoli Epheso, locorum omnium Episcopos, convenire iussit: That Theodosius by his Imperiall letters, commanded the Bishops of all places, to meete together at Ephesus the Metropolitan Citie.

Conc. Chalcedon.  
Actio prima

Leo Epist. 9

Leo Epist. 24.

Leon. 1575

The fourth generall Councell, was the Councell of Chalcedon, and this also was summoned, not by authoritie and commandement of *Leo* the first, Bishop of Rome, as my Adversarie affirmeth, but the Emperors Authority, and commandement. This may appeare even by *Leo* himselfe Epist. 43. 53. and sundrie other of his Epistles. But we neede not to cite other testimonies: For, the verie Councell of Chalcedon it selfe, doth testifie, that it was summoned by the Emperors, and that the Bishop of Rome was also called thither, who because he could not be there in person, sent others in his steade. Yea, that *Leo* Bishop of Rome, did not summon this Councell, nor any other generall Councell in those dayes, but acknowledged it to be a right belonging to the Emperors, is further verie manifest by the Epistle he writeth to the Emperor, wherein he saith thus unto him: *Pietas vestra suggestioni, ac supplicationi nostrae dignetur annuere, ut intra Italiam iubeatis haberi Episcopale Concilium.* Let your pietie vouchsafe to yeld to our suggestion and supplication, in this, that you command a Councell of Bishops to be held within Italy. Again he saith thus. *Omnes partium nostrarum Ecclesiae, omnes mansuetudini vestrae cum gemitibus, & lacrimis supplicant sacerdotes, ut generalem Synodum iubeatis infra Italiam celebrari.* All the Churches that take part with us, and all the Priests, with sighes and teares doe humbly beseech your mansuetude, that



that you will command a generall Councell to be celebrated within Italy. He also solicited the Princeſſe Pulcheria, and the Nobles, Cleargie, and people of *Conſtantinople*, for a Councell to be held in *Italie*: But neyther in his fiſt ſuite, nor in this laſt, did he prevaile, all this notwithstanding. For, as touching his former ſuite, which was in the time of the Emperor *Theodoſius* the younger, that Emperor (as before appeareth) aſſembled the Councell, not within *Italie*, (as *Leo* deſired,) but at *Ephesus*. And as touching the latter, it is alſo apparant, that by the Emperors appointment and commandement, the Councell was aſſembled, not in *Italie*, (as the Pope would have had it,) but at *Chalcedon*.

*Leo Epiſt.* 26.  
23.

I might proceede further, and ſhew, that, beſide theſe fiſt foure generall Councells, other Councells were likewiſe ſummoned and aſſembled, by the Authoritie and commandement of the Emperors, and not of the Biſhops of *Rome*. For there was alſo a fiſt generall Councell ſummoned, or called, *Mandato Juſtiniani*, By the commandement of the Emperor *Iuſtinian*, as *Evagrius* witneſſeth. And ſo likewiſe ſaith *Nicephorus*, that, *Imperator Iuſtinianus ſanctam quintam Oecumenicam Synodum, Episcopis omnium Eccleſiarum convocatis coegit*. The Emperor *Iuſtinian*, aſſembled the fiſt holy generall Councell, by calling the Biſhops of all Churches together. The Councell of *Sardica* alſo, was called by the Emperors Authoritie and commandement, as *Socrates*, and *Theodore* declare. And ſo were alſo thoſe Councells of *Seleucia*, and *Arimine*, called by the Emperors Authoritie and commandement. Yea, what generall Councell was there called in thoſe ancient times, but by the Emperors? In ſomuch, that Cardinall *Cusanus* himſelfe ingenuouſly confeſſeth and affirmeth, that, *The fiſt eight generall Councells were called by the Emperors*. Is

*Evagri. lib. 4. c. 17.*  
*Niceph. lib. 17. cap. 17.*

*Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 20 in the greek,*  
*& cap. 16. in the latin.*  
*Theodore lib. 2. cap. 8. Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 37. in the greek, & cap. 29 in the latin.*  
*Cusan. de conſ. lib. 2. cap. 25.*

there then any credite at all to be given to those Papists in these dayes, who doe, and dare denie this so cleare, manifest, and evident a truth? Wherefore it being a thing most apparant, that in ancient times, the Emperors by their Authoritie and commandement, called the generall Councils: it followeth necessarily thereupon, that the Emperors thereby commanded aswell the Bishop of *Rome*, as the other Bishops, and consequently had the Supremacie, aswell over the one, as over the other.

9 But yet further to prove the Supremacie of the Emperors, I alledged, that the Emperors in ancient time, banished, imprisoned, and otherwise also punished, by their Authoritie, even some of the Bishops of *Rome* themselves, aswell as other Bishops. Whereunto mine Adversarie answereth, that, *These things they did, de facto, but not warrantable de jure.* But why were they not warrantable *de jure*? I grant, that a banishment or imprisonment may possibly be sometimes wrongfull and unjust, in respect of the man, and the matter, that deserveth it not: but this is no impeachment or argument therefore against the lawfulnessse of the authoritie. As if an Emperor, or King doe banish, or committe a man to prison, for professing any point of true Religion, this banishment and imprisonment is wrongfull and unjust, in respect of the cause, which deserveth no punishment at all. Yet it cannot be denied, but he hath power & Authoritie good and lawfull enough, both to banish, and to committe to prison notwithstanding, when there is a just cause: For that which is but an abuse of Authoritie, doth not take away the lawfull use of it. So that if any Bishop of *Rome*, or any Bishop whoeuer within the Dominions of the Empyre, did offend so farre, as to deserve banishment, imprisonment, or other Temporall and Civill punishment, it was a thing lawfull and

and just for the Emperor, to inflict those punishments upon them, as well as upon any other. For it is, indeede, to these *Higher Powers*, namely, to Emperors, Kings and Princes, that God hath committed the Civill and Temporall sword, for the encouragement and prayse of them that doe well, & for the discouragement, terror, & punishment of those that doe evill: And these be *Ministri Dei*, *The Ministers of God*, (as *S. Paul* also sheweth,) instituted for that verie end and purpose. Now none will denie, but banishment, and imprisonment be punishments Civill and Temporall, and not *Ecclesiasticall*, and doe rightly and properly belong to the Authority of Emperors, Kings and Princes, and not to the function and office of Bishops, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers. And therefore the banishment, and imprisonment, that any Emperors or Kings, used against any Bishops, or others upon just cause, and when they deserved it, must needs be granted to be things done by them, (both in respect of the authoritie, and in respect of the cause also,) as well *de jure*, as *de facto*, that is, to be things lawfull, warrantable, and justifieable, in all respects. For, as for those distinctions, that Emperors and Kings have Authoritie, over persons *Temporall*, but not *Ecclesiasticall*: and a *Power directive*, but not *Coactive*, and in causes *Civill* and *Temporall*, but *not in Ecclesiasticall*: The untruth, absurditie, folly, & impierie of all these distinctions, hath beene before so sufficiently discovered, that I shall not neede to speake any more of them: And by this time, I hope, that even the Papists themselves bee ashamed of them: Sure I am, they have good cause so to be, if they did duely ponder, and consider them.

Seeing then it is confessed, that the Emperors did in ancient time by their Authoritie, banish, imprison, and otherwise punish even Bishops of *Rome*, as well as other

Bishops, &c. that no reason can be shewed against the doing hereof, when they be such offenders, as that they justly deserve such punishment, it is thereby undeniably apparent, that the Bishop of *Rome* in those dayes had not the Supremacie over the Emperors, but that cleane contrarie-wise, the Emperors had the Supremacie over him, aswell, as over any others within their Empyre.

Another Argument which I use, consisteth in this, that I say, even Kings of *Rome*, did also sometimes send the Bishops of *Rome*, as their Embassadors. By this argument my Adversarie saith, *That he supposeth, that I meant, but to make men merry.* Why? In serious matters, I love not to be (as he is many times,) ridiculous, but to be serious, and to deale seriously. First therefore, hereby I prove that the Bishop of *Rome* was not in those dayes, superior or greater then the King that sent him: For those wordes of Christ must ever be true, where he saith: *The Servant is not greater then his Master, nor the messenger greater then he that sent him.*

And secondly, I say further, that this is a verie good and strong argument, to prove the Supremacie to be, in those dayes, in the Kings of *Rome*, and not in the Bishops of *Rome*. For, the King that sendeth any, as his Embassador, is in all common understanding, supposed, and to be supposed, superior unto him that is his Embassador. As when *Hiram* King of *Tyrus* sent messengers to King *David*, or when *Ben-hadad* King of *Aram* or *Siria*, sent messengers to *Abah* King of *Israell*, or when King *David* sent messengers unto the King of the *Ammonites*: In all these cases, and every such like, (for, *Nec in ceteris est contrarium videre*,) were those Kings superior or greater then the messengers, or Embassadors, whom they sent. And therefore when *Theodorick* sent *Iohn* Bishop of *Rome*, as his Embassador

*Iohn. 13. 16.*

*2. Sam. 5. 11.  
1. Chron. 14. 1.  
1. King 20. 2.  
1. Chron. 19. 2.*



bassador unto the Emperor *Iustine*: and when King *Theo-*  
*datus* sent *Agapetus* Bishop of *Rome*, as his Embassador to  
*Iustinian* the Emperor: It must be confessed, that these  
 Kings were likewise superiors to the Bishops of *Rome*, and  
 had the command of them, and not contrarywise that  
 those Bishops of *Rome*, had the superioritie, or command  
 over those Kings. For amongst men, the Master is wont  
 to send the Servant, and the King his Subject, and the su-  
 perior his inferior. But where did you ever reade, heare, or  
 know, the Servant to send his Master, or the Subject to  
 send his King and Sovereigne, or the inferior to send his  
 Superior on a message? I grant, that an inferior, or equall  
 may intreate a Superior to doe a businesse for him, and that  
 a King, a Master, or Superior, may goe by his owne con-  
 sent, or of his owne accord, somewhither, to doe his Sub-  
 ject, Servant, or inferior, a good turne. But it cannot be  
 rightly, and properly said, that any of these inferiors, have  
 sent their Superiors upon their errand, service, message, or  
 embassage. Yea, it would be held verie absoneous and ab-  
 surd so to speake. But my Adversary, I see, mistaketh the  
*Matter* propeffion of my argument: For it reacheth not  
 so high as heaven, much lesse to the most glorious, incom-  
 prehensible, and ineffable *Trinitie*, blessed for ever, but  
 onely to men upon earth: and not to all men neyther, but  
 onely to Kings and Bishops. Neyther had my Adversary  
 any just cause or reason, to stretch or extend it any further.  
 For the question was onely concerning them, whether of  
 them had the Superioritie, or Supremacie, over the other,  
 in that time, namely, whether the Kings that then raigned  
 over *Rome*, or, those that were the Bishops thereof. I to  
 prove the Superioritie or Supremacie, to be in the Kings,  
 and not in the Bishops, alledged this for my reason, that  
 the Kings of *Rome*, did sometimes send the Bishops of

*Rome*, as their Embassadors, to other Princes: So that my Argument upon the whole matter, appeareth to be this. What Kings soever, (I speake of earthly Kings,) sent any at any time, as their Embassadors, to other Princes, those Kings were Superior and greater, then those Embassadors whom they sent: But the Kings of *Rome*, did send the Bishops of *Rome*, as their Embassadors, to other Princes: *Ergo* the Kings of *Rome*, were Superior, and greater then the Bishops of *Rome*. The *Major* is apparant by induction of particulars, & by ordinarie, & common experience in the world. The *Minor* is manifest by Ecclesiasticall historie, which testifieth, That King *Theodoricke*, sent *Iohn* Bishop of *Rome*, as his Embassador to the Emperor *Iustine*: And that King *Theodatus*, sent likewise *Agapetus* Bishop of *Rome*, as his Embassador, to the Emperor *Iustinian*: And therefore the conclusion must needs follow, and cannot bee gainesaid. By this time then, mine Adversarie seeth, (I hope,) that such is the evident strength of this Argument, as that he with all his wit and learning, will never bee able to make any good answer thereunto.

Lib. Pontific. in  
Iohan. 1. Et A-  
nast. in Agapeto  
Diacono,  
Platina,

10 In my former Booke, Cap. 1. pag. 13. 14. 15. I also shewed, that against the title and appellation of *Univerfall Bishop*, or *head* of the *univerfall Church*, did two Bishops of *Rome* oppose themselves, namely, *Pelagius* and *Gregory the great*, when it was first affected by *Iohn* the Patriarch, and Bishop of *Constantinople*: And that neverthelesse afterward, a Bishop of *Rome*, namely, *Boniface the third*, got, & obtayned it of *Phocas*, the Emperor. Hereunto mine Adversarie answereth, (as *Bellarmino* likewise doth,) That this fact of *Phocas* was but a declaratiō of that, which was ever before belonging to the Bishops of *Rome*. What? Had the former Bishops of *Rome*, & all the predecessors to *Gregorie*, this title of *univerfall Bishop* peculiarized, & appropriated un-

to them? Why then did *Gregorie* himselfe say? None of my predecessors Bishops of Rome, ever consented to use this so ungodly a name; or why did he say? That no Bishop of Rome ever tooke upō him, this name of singularitie. Yea, he saith: We the Bishops of Rome, will not receive this honour being offered unto us. Wherefore, it is apparant, that neyther before the times of *Gregorie*, nor in the times of this *Gregory*, any of the Bishops of Rome, had this title. Yea, you see this title detested, and rejected, even by and in the Bishops of Rome themselves, as well as in any other Bishops. So that they did not onely condemne it in *Iohn*, the Patriarch of Constantinople, but generally in all Bishops whatsoever, as being injurious not onely to other Bishops, but especially to *CRIST IESVS*, the onely right and true Vniversall Bishop, and the sole, and onely Head of the Vniversall Church. *Vniversa sibi tentat ascribere*, (saith *Gregory*,) *Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 32. 36. 33. 39.*  
*& omnia quæ soli uni capiti coherent, videlicet, Christo, per relationem pompatici sermonis, ejusdem Christi sibi studeat membra subjugare.* He goeth about to ascribe all to himselfe, (saith he,) and endevoureth by the loftinesse of his pompous title, to subjugate unto himselfe, all the members of Christ, which of right are to cleave to one onely head, which is Christ.

This title then of Vniversall Bishop, or head of the whole Church upon earth, appeareth to be as wicked and as unlawfull in *Boniface the third*, Bishop of Rome, and his successors; as it was or would have beene in *Iohn* Bishop of Constantinople, and his successors, if it had rested in them. For, that which *Boniface the third*, obtayned of *Phocas* the Emperour, is the very same thing, which *Iohn* Bishop of Constantinople, sought to get and obtaine. This (if any make a doubt of it), is apparant. For, first *Paulus Diaconus*, saith, *Hic Phocas, rogante Papa Bonifacio, statuit, sedem Romana Ecclesia, ut caput esset omnium Ecclesiarum, quia* *Paul. warnefrid. Phoca.*

Vſpergens, Cbro-  
nic.

Platin Bonifac. 3

Blondus.

Naucerus, vol. 2  
Generat. 21.

quia Ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium Eccleſiarum ſcribebat. This Emperor Phocas, at the ſuite of Pope Boniface ordayned, that the Sea of Rome ſhould be the head of all Churches, becauſe the Church of Conſtantinople wrote her ſelfe the chiefe of all Churches. In like ſort, ſpeaketh Abbas Vſpergenſis: Poſt Sabinianū, Bonifacius eligitur ad Pontificatum: cujus rogatu Phocas conſtituit ſedem Romanæ, & Apoſtolice Eccleſie, caput eſſe omnium Eccleſiarum, nam antea, Conſtantinopolitana ſe ſcribebat primam omnium. After Sabinian, (ſaith he,) was Boniface choſen to the Popedom, at whoſe requeſt, Phocas ordayned, that the Sea of the Romanæ, and Apoſtolicke Church, ſhould be the head of all Churches: for, formerly, the Church of Conſtantinople had written her ſelfe the chiefe of all. Plätina alſo ſaith, that Bonifacius, à Phoca Imperatore, obtinuit, magna tamen contentione: Boniface obtayned this, of Phocas the Emperour, but with great contending for it: quem quidem locum, Ecclesia Conſtantinopolitana ſibi vendicare conabatur: Which place, (ſaith he,) the Church of Conſtantinople endeavoured to challenge to her ſelfe. Blondus alſo ſaith: Ad hujus Bonifacii petitionem, Phocas Antiltitem Romanum, principem Epiſcoporum omnium dixit: At the ſuite of this Boniface, did Phocas affirme the Biſhop of Rome, to be the Prince of all Biſhops. And Naucerus likewiſe ſaith, that, Bonifacius inſolentiam Patriarchæ Conſtantinopolitani, cum & ipſi uxorſe appellantis, compeſcuit: Phocas enim Pontificis ſuaſione, publica, ac ad univerſum orbem diſmiſſa ſanctione, conſtituit, ut Romanæ Eccleſie, Romanoque Pontifici, omnes orbis Eccleſie obedirent. Boniface repreſſed the inſolencie of the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, calling himſelfe Oecumenicall, or univerſall Biſhop: For, Phocas, by the perſuaſion of the Pope, ordayned by a publicke Decree, ſent to the whole world, that all the Churches of the world, ſhould be obedient to the Church of Rome. By all theſe teſtimonies then,



then, you perceave, that what *Iohn* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, did formerly desire, and seeke after, that did *Boniface* the third, Bishop of *Rome*, obtaine of *Phocas* the Emperor: and consequently, that title of universall Bishop, must needs be, as hatefull and damnable in *Boniface* the third, Bishop of *Rome*, and his successors, as it was, or would have beene, by the judgement of *Pelagius* and *Gregorie*, in *Iohn* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and his successors. As also I trust you now sufficiently ~~know~~<sup>perceive</sup>, how fond and false an evasion, that is, which my Adversarie, and *Bellarmino* also useth. For, if this granting of the title of the universall Bishop to *Boniface* the third, had beene, (as they say,) nothing else, but a declaration of the thing, ever before acknowledged to belong to the Bishops of *Rome*. What cause, or neede was there, for *Boniface* the third, Bishop of *Rome*, to have beene such an earnest, and importunate suter for the obtaining of it, at this time? Or, why did those two Patriarches, the one of *Constantinople*, the other of *Rome*, strive and contend at this time so much for it? Or why was *Phocas* himselfe so hardly, and not without much a doe, induced to yeeld it to *Rome*, rather then to *Constantinople*, which was then the seat of the Emperors? Or if it were a thing ever before acknowledged, to be due, to the Bishops of *Rome*, why did those two Bishops of *Rome*, so hotely and eagerly oppose themselves, against it, utterly detesting and condemning it, not onely in *Iohn* Bishop of *Constantinople*, but generally in all Bishops who-soever? as their speeches, arguments, and reasons doe declare. Yea, how can it be true, that the Bishops of *Rome* had evermore this title, when *Gregorie* the great, Bishop of *Rome*, himselfe testifieth the cleave contrarie: laying, (as you heard before) that none of his predecessors, Bishops of *Rome*, did at any time consent to use so ungodly a name:

and that no Bishop of *Rome* at any time, tooke upon him, this name of singulartie: and, that they the Bishops of *Rome* would not take it, though it were offered to them. Is it not then a point of grosse impudencie in Papists, still to denie such apparant and manifest truths?

But afterward againe in a scoffing manner, hee saith, that I give notice that I am a *Logician*, by affirming in the 11. pag. of the first part of my Booke, that the effect of the negative clause in the Oath of Supremacie, is included in the former affirmative clause of the same Oath. The affirmative clause, (saith he,) of the Oath, is that the King is the Supreme Governor in his owne Dominions: The negative clause is, that no forraine Prince, Person, Prelate, &c. And so he goeth on, mispending his time, and confusing the imagination and devise of his owne braine. For, the affirmative clause in the Oath, is not, as he imperfectly and lamely relateth it, but it is this: That the King, is the onely Supreme Governor of this Realme, and of all other his Highnesse Dominions and Countries, as well in all Spirituall, or Ecclesiasticall things or causes, as Temporall. The negative clause followeth, and is this; That no forraine Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preheminence, or authoritie Ecclesiasticall, or Spirituall, within this Realme. (This word, (*Onely*,) in the affirmative clause, hath he left out: which if he had added together with all the rest of the wordes, that follow in that affirmative clause: he would very easily have found that to be true, which I wrote, namely, that the effect of the negative clause, is included in the former affirmative. For, he that affirmeth the King, to be the onely Supreme Governor within his owne Dominions, & that in all things, or causes Spirituall or Ecclesiasticall, as well as temporall:

doth,

doth, in that speech, exclude every forraine Prince, person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, from having any supreme government, or any government at all, without his leave and licence, within his Dominions. Yea, it is very evident, that the former affirmative clause includeth the negative clause, and more. For the negative clause excludeth forrain Princes, persons, Prelates, States & Potētates, only from Ecclesiasticall, or Spirituall Authoritie: but the former affirmative excludeth them from authoritie in all things or causes both temporall & spirituall. Againe, you see that the negative clause extendeth onely to forraine persons: but the affirmative clause extendeth to any persons whosoever, whether forraine, or domesticall.

Thirdly, the negative clause excludeth forraine persons, from having any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preheminence, or Authoritie Ecclesiasticall, or spirituall, within this Realme. But, the former affirmative clause, extendeth not only to this Realme, or that Realme, in particular, but generally to all his Majesties Realms, Dominions, & Countries. So that the former affirmative clause, in the Oath, appeareth to be much more generall, and of a farre larger extent, then the negative is. And therefore, I hope, I spake truely, and within compasse, when I said, (though in a *parenthesis*) that the effect of the negative clause, was included in the former affirmative. I did not say, (as mine Adversarie supposeth me to hold,) that the Regall power includeth the Sacerdotall, or Episcopall. This is but his owne dreame & imagination: in the confutation whereof, he laboureth in vaine. For, neyther I, nor any of the Protestants, doe hold that opinion, but contrariwise doe hold them to be things distinct, as is before declared. But because he will needes catpe at my Logicke, when he hath no cause: let other men judge, what a great *Logician* he is,

whilst he argueth thus. The Regall power includeth not the Sacerdotall: *Ergo* the affirmative clause in the Oath of SUPREMACIE, includeth not the negative clause in the same Oath.

Hitherto, then you see, that my Adversarie, (notwithstanding all his flourishes, braggs, and bravadoes), hath shewed himselfe to be, not onely a punie Lawyer, (as he confesseth himselfe to be,) but a punie Logician also, & most of all, a punie Divine: and that he hath not beene able, to make any good Answer, or to refell and confute any one Argument contayned in this first Chapter of my former Booke, concerning the Supremacie: and yet hath he also left a great part of that Chapter unanswered. Neyther hath he made throughout his whole discourse, and pleading, so much as one good argument, to prove his Clients cause, that is, the Popes supremacie: though he purposed, and laboured to doe it. Where, is it not a mervaille, that he being a Lawyer, and a Subject to our Sovereigne Lord, the KING, will dare nevertheless, to admitte of such a Client as the Pope is, and of his cause, which he knoweth before hand, to be condemned, by the Lawes, and Statutes of the Realme, and which he now may see, (if hee saw it not before,) to be also condemned by the Lawes and Statutes of God himselfe, and by all the most ancient Ecclesiasticall Records. But, if hee be not ashamed of such a Client and his cause: his Client, (I suppose,) will be ashamed of him, and entertaine him no longer, to pleade for him, unlesse he could doe it better. And yet indeede, when his Clients cause, is foule, & naught, (as here it appeareth to be,) what Lawyer, be he never so learned, or what Divine, be hee never so profound, is able to justifie it, or to make it good? Notwithstanding his demurrer therefore, and notwithstanding that by this his plea, his purpose was



to arrest and stay mens judgements, I trust they will all, now, ( no cause appearing to the contrarie, ) proceede without any further delay, to give their sentence against his Client, & for & in the behalfe of these two most worthy & Peerles Princes, who be the complaynants against him: namely, for Christ I E S V S, in their acknowledging, and publishing him, ~~only~~, to be the onely univerrall Bishop, supreme Pastor, and head of the whole Church Militant upon Earth, aswell as of the Triumphant in Heaven: and for the King, in declaring and publishing him, under God, to be the onely Supreme Governor, over all manner of persons, and in all kinde of causes, aswell Ecclesiasticall as Civill, within his Dominions. Neyther doe I doubt, but all mens judgements, whensoever upon good and well advised deliberation they shall please to give them, will passe accordingly. In the meane time, let us goe on to the second Chapter, & see if he have any better successe in that, then he hath found in the former.

*Concerning the second Chapter.*

**I**N this second Chapter of my former Booke, my Adversarie supposeth, that my mainescope and purpose, was, to prove our Church, that is, the Church of the Protestants, to have beene, in the Apostles times: *But never was there,* (saith he,) *poore Assertion so miserably mangled.* And true it is indeede, that it is miserably mangled, and cut in pieces. But, by whom? namely, by himselfe. For, my Assertion is not so short, as he relateth it, nor is to end where he maketh it to end, but is of a longer, and larger extent: and being produced not by parts or pieces, but wholly and intirely, (as

it ought, ) it is this (*viz.*) That our Church was in the Apostles dayes, and in all times and ages since, howsoever, or, notwithstanding, that Poperie did, as an infection, or corruption grow unto it: the meaning & true sence whereof, is no more, but, that the growing of Poperie, it being but as an infection or corruption to the Church, is no impediment, or argument to the contrarie, but that our Church had a being in the Apostles dayes, and in all succeeding times and ages, that notwithstanding. This will the better appeare, if you take the whole Proposition or assertion, and turne it into a Question. For, then the Question will not be, as mine Adversary maketh it: (*viz.*) whether our Church were in the Apostles dayes: for that compriseth not the whole Proposition, but is onely a part, or piece of it. Neyther can that be any more the Question, then whether it were in the succeeding and after times, and ages. But the Question will bee, as I have signified before, *viz.* Whether the growth and comming in of Poperie, as an infection or corruption to the Church, did hinder, or was any such obstacle, or impediment as that, by reason thereof, our Church had no being at all, in the Apostles dayes, nor in the dayes, and times succeeding. It is true, that if I had said, that our Church was, in the Apostles times, and had gone no further: it had beene an absolute and direct affirmation of our Church to have beene in those dayes. But when I goe further, and say, that our Church was in the Apostles dayes, notwithstanding that the seeds of Popery began then to be sown: in this speech, I doe not absolutely, and simply affirme, that our Church was then, but that it was then, notwithstanding that the seeds of Poperie began then to be sown: that is, the beginning and growth of Poperie, was no obstacle, impediment, or argument against the being of our Church in those

those dayes. As likewise if I say, that the conveyance made to *Iohn at Stile* is good, notwithstanding that there was no liverye of seisin made upon it: this is no direct affirmation, that his conveyance is simply good, to all intents and purposes: but, that it is good, notwithstanding this exception, that there was no liverye and seisin made: that is, the not making of liverye of seisin, is no obstacle or impediment, to hinder the goodnesse of it. In like sort, if I say, that *K. Salomon* was a saved soule, notwithstanding that by the enticement of his wives, he became an Idolater: this is no absolute or direct affirmatiō, that he was a saved soule. But that he was a saved soule, notwithstanding that reason or allegation: that is to say, his committing of Idolatrie, upon the enticement of his wives, is no such obstacle, or prooffe to the contrarie, but that he might be a saved soule, that reason or objection notwithstanding. As againe, if I say, that my Adversarie is a good Grecian, or a good Hebritian, notwithstanding that he hath not shewed it in his Answer: this is no direct affirmation, that hee is eyther a good Grecian or a good Hebritian: but the sence and meaning of that speech is, that his not shewing of skill in Greeke or Hebrew in his Answer, is no obstacle, or argument to the contrarie, but that he may be a good Grecian, or a good Hebritian, that notwithstanding. Wherefore if mine Adversarie would have opposed himselfe, against that proposition or assertion of mine before mentioned, he should have shewed & proved, (if he had beene able,) that the comming in, and growth of Poperie, was such an impediment or obstacle, as that by reason thereof our Church could have no being in the Apostles dayes, or in the times, or ages that succeeded: which because he hath not done, he hath spent his breath, and talked idly, and in vaine, and to no purpose. And yet hee seemeth to glorie  
and

and insult over me, that my conclusion & assertion, being (as he saith), that our Church was in the Apostles times, I brought not so much as one argument, there to prove it: how much more cause now have I, (if I were so disposed), to glorie and insult over him, who by his cutting, curtailing and mangling my assertion, and not taking it wholly and intirely, (as of right he should,) hath utterly mistaken the Question, & not answered one word to that which was the Question indeede. For the question to be deduced, out of this entier Proposition, nor being (as he hath strangely mistaken), whether our Church was in the Apostles times: nor yet, whether it were in the succeeding, and aftertimes. But, whether Poperie were such an obstacle, or impediment, as that it did cause that our Church could not, by reason thereof, have any being at all, eyther in the Apostles times, or in the times and ages that succeeded: To this it is that I answered and adressed my speech in that second Chapter: and to this Question also it is, that mine Adversarie should have answered, and adressed his speech, if he would have spoken materially and to the purpose.

And yet even this verie assertion, that our Church (that is, men beleeving and professing the same Faith and Religion, that we doe), was in the Apostles times, and by them taught and approved, is a thing evidently declared, not in one Chapter alone of my former Booke, (for one Chapter alone, would not suffice, for so many points, and positions, as did to such a matter belong), nor in all these verall Chapters and whole Contents of my Booke put together. And the truth of it may summarily, & briefly thus appeare, namely, by that excellent rule, and fundamentall ground, which *Tertullian* giveth. For, he saith, that even those Churches, *quæ licet nullam ex Apostolis, vel*

*Tertul. prescrip.  
advers. haer.*



*Apostolicis authorē suū proferāt, (ut multo posteriores, quæ deniq; quotidie instituuntur,) tamē in eadē fide cōspirātes, nō minus Apostolica deputātur, pro consanguinitate doctrinæ: which cannot bring any of the Apostles, or Apostolicke men for their authors, (as those that be much later, & such as are begun every day,) yet agreeing with thē in the same faith, are for this cōsanguinitie, or agree mēt in doctrine, held to be no lesse Apostolicke, then the rest. Againe he saith: Ipsa doctrina eorum, cum Apostolica comparata, ex diversitate, & contrarietate sua, pronuntiabit, neque Apostoli alicujus authoris esse, neque Apostolici. Their verie doctrine is selfe being compared with the Apostolicke, by the diversitie and contrarietie that is betweene them, will pronounce, that it had for the Author, neyther any Apostle, nor any man that was Apostolicall. From this rule, and fundamentall ground, I deduce, and make two Arguments, (the one for our Church, the other against the Church of Rome.) For our Church my Argument is this. That Church which holdeth the same Faith, doctrine, & Religion, that the Apostles taught in their dayes, is Apostolicall: But our Church, that is the Church of the Protestants, holdeth the same Faith, doctrine and Religion, that the Apostles taught in their dayes. Ergo our Church, that is the Church of the Protestants, is Apostolicall. The Major is verie evident of it selfe, and by the testimonie also of Tertullian, neyther can it be denied. The Minor is also evident by conferring, and comparing our Faith, doctrine, & Religion, with the Apostolicall writings, & the rest of the Canonickall Scriptures. And it is also manifest, by the whole Contents of my former Booke, whether I referre you for the prooffe of it (if any make doubt of it: ) And therefore the conclusion must bee granted. On the other side, against the Church of Rome, from that ground also, I thus frame my argument. That Church which holdeth a*

*Tertul. praescrip.  
advers. haeret.  
cap. 32.*

Religion, Faith, and doctrine, differing or contrarie to that which was taught by the Apostles in their times, is not Apostolicall: But the Popish Church, holdeth a Religion, Faith, and doctrine, differing, or contrarie to that, which was taught by the Apostles in their times, (as is apparant, if you compare them together, examining the severall, and particular Positions, in these points of Controversie, by the writings of the Apostles, & the rest of the Canonickall Scriptures, & as is also shewed at large in my former book; whether I likewise referre you, for the prooofe of this *Minor Proposition*:) And therefore the Popish Church is not Apostolicall. But mine Adversarie taketh here exception to our Church, affirming it in three points to be hereticall, *First in the point of Iustification*. For, he saith, it was the heresie of the *Symonians and Eunomians*, to hold Iustification in Gods sight, by grace, and by faith onely, as the Protestants doe. And, that *S. Augustine* also affirmeth it to be an error, that sprung up even in the Apostles dayes. But touching the *Symonians*, they held, (as *Irenaeus* declareth,) That they were to be saved by the grace of *Simon Magus*, their self Master, whom they make their God and Saviour. The Protestants hold no such abominable thing, but contrarywise hold, that they are to be saved by the grace of CHRIST. What? Is it all one with Papists, to be saved by *Simons* grace, and by the grace of CHRIST? As for the *Eunomians*, such was their doctrine of Faith, as that they rejected, or made no reckoning of good workes at all, Yea, they held, (as *S. Augustine* sheweth,) *Quod nihil homini obesset quorumlibet perpetratio peccatorum*. That the committing of any sinnes whatsoever, did not hurt a man. The Protestants teach no such wicked, and damnable doctrine, but cleane contrarywise, doe teach, that the Faith that justifieth, and saveth a man, is not a dead but a lively Faith, that is, such as is accompanied

*Iren. lib. 1. c. 20.*

*Aug. hares. 54.*

nied with good works, and with a godly conversation: although, in the act of our justification in Gods sight and censure, it is Faith alone, and not the workes, that is, the hand or instrument, whereby wee apprehend, or receive CHRIST IESVS, who is indeede our righteousnesse. As the eye, in respect of the rest of the members, wherewith it is accompanied, is not alone, yet, in respect of the power and facultie of seeing, it is sole and alone. And, as, in fire likewise, there is both heate, and light, and the heate is not alone, but accompanied with the light: and yet it is the heate onely, and not the light, that warmeth the bodie. So in a man justified, there is Faith, and good workes accompanying it, and in respect of the good workes wherewith it is accompanied it is not sole, and alone, but yet, in the Act and point of Iustification in Gods sight, as it apprehendeth Christ our righteousnesse, it is sole and alone, good works having no parte with it, in that action. As for that which is alledged out of S. *Augustine*, I answered it in my former Booke, and now I answer it once againe, or rather S. *Augustine* himselfe answereth it, whilst he sheweth, *That the error which sprung up in the Apostles dayes was of such, as held Faith onely, to be sufficient to salvation, although they did no good works at all, but lived wickedly, dissolutely, lewdly: which is indeede, an error, and a grosse error, and which the Protestants, with S. Augustine, with S. Paul, with S. James, with S. Peter, with S. Iohn, & with all the rest of the sacred Scriptures, doe likewise utterly condemne.*

Ierem. 33. 6.

Ierem. 33. 16.

2. Cor. 5. 21.

Rom. 10. 4.

Rom. 9. 30. 31. 32.

Rom. 7. 14.

Ioh. 3. 14. 15. 16.

Iohu. 1. 12.

Aug. de fide, &amp; opur. cap. 14.

Galar. 5. 6.

Ierem. 2. 14.

1. Pet. 2. 9. 11. 12.

2 Pet. 1. 10.

1. Iohu. 3. 10.

The second point wherein he supposeth heresie in our Church, is concerning their Popish Purgatorie. It is true, that we demie it. Neyther are the Papists able to prove the deniall of it to be cyther heresie or error. My Adversarie saith, *That Luther, Calvine, & others, did likewise demie it; & what of that? was it therefore heresie? Or, in what Church*

was it censured and condemned to be heresie. If by any, he must say, it was by his owne, the Popish Church, which condemneth indeede, not only that, but all other doctrines and Positions of the Protestants, wherein they differ from them, be they never so true. But it is proved in my former Booke, *That Papal Rome, is the whore of Babylon*, and that the Popish Church hath not Christ, but Antichrist to be the head, and to rule, and raigne over it. Neyther is it mine opinion, along that the Pope of Rome, the head, and ruler thereof, is the grand Antichrist, (and consequently his Church, the false, & Antichristian Church,) but it is the opinion, and position of all sound Protestants likewise: as their many and sundrie learned Works, written in defence of that Protestant Position against the Papists, doe plentifully, and at large declare. Now then is it any metvaile, or any matter, that the false, adulterate, and Antichristian Church, condempneth the right beleeving, Orthodoxe, and true Christian Church, and her Positions? Yea, in this point, against their Purgatorie, did the Apostolicke, Primitive, and most ancient Church beleeve, as wee doe. For, S. Paul saith, of all Gods people, *That whilst they are in the bodie, they are absent from the Lord: and that when they goe out of the bodie, they are present with the Lord.* And so holdeth S. Cyprian, *That the servants of God, then have peace, and then enjoy free and quiet rest: And that being drayen out from the stormes of this world, they arrive at the haven of their everlasting habitation and securitie.* Againe he saith, *Ad refrigerium iusti vocantur, ad supplicium rapiuntur iniusti.* The righteous are called to a refreshing: the unrighteous are haled to torment. In somuch that hee saith further, concerning godly persons, when they die, that *Nec accipiendas esse hic atra vestes, quando illi ibi indumenta alba iam sumpserint.* For them, blacke mourning garments are not to be worne here,

be-

Col. 2. 13.

2. Cor. 5. 6.

7. bit. 1. 23.

Cyprian. de mor.  
salutar. sect. 2.  
cap. 1. 391.

Ibidem. sect. 11.

Ibidem. sect. 14.



because they have there already put on white raiment. Iustine <sup>Iustine, respons.</sup> Martyr likewise saith: That after the departure of the soule <sup>ad Orthodox,</sup> out of the bodie, there is, presently, made a difference betwixt <sup>quart. 75.</sup> the just, and the unjust. For, the soules of the just goe to Paradise, where they have the comerce and sight of Angels, and Archangels, &c: The soules of the unjust, to the places in Hell. S. <sup>Hilar. in Psal. 2.</sup> Hillarie also observeth, out of that which is mentioned in the Gospell, concerning the Rich-man & Lazarus, that as soone as this life is ended, everie one, (without delay), goeth either to Abrahams bosome, or to the place of torment: and in this place, is reserved, till the day of judgement. S. Ambrose <sup>Ambros. de bonis</sup> also teacheth, That death is a certaine haven to them, who <sup>morib. cap. 4.</sup> being tossed in the great sea of this world, desire the station of a safe rest. And therefore he saith further, That whereas fooles doe feare death as the chiefe of evils: Wise men doe desire it, as a rest after labours, and an end of their evils. S. Basil <sup>Basil. prom. in</sup> saith, <sup>regulas suis</sup> This present world, is the time of repentance, the other of retri- <sup>disposit.</sup> bution: this of working, that of rewarding: this of patient suffering, that of receaving comfort. Gregory Nazianzen also in his Funeral orations, hath many sayings to this purpose, <sup>Greg. Naz. Orat.</sup> and was so farre from supposing any Purgatorie, or pur- <sup>9. ad Iulianum,</sup> ging prepared for men after their death, that hee plainly <sup>& orat. 42. in</sup> denieth, That after the night of this present life, there is any <sup>Pasch. & orat. 15</sup> purging to be expected. And therefore he giveth us all good <sup>in plagam gran-</sup> counsell, telling us, That it is better to be corrected, and pur- <sup>dini.</sup> ged now, then to be sent unto torments there, where the time of punishing is, and not of purging. And concerning the third point, wherein he objecteth heresie: It is true, that Popish Priests cannot forgive sinnes, because they be not the Ministers of Christ, but of Antichrist: and therefore, for any to resort, or to goe unto them for absolution, or forgive- nesse of sinnes, must needs rather increase their sinnes, then take away any. The authoritie neverthelesse of Christ his

Ministers, to binde and loose, and to remitte, and retaine sinnes, we denie not, but affirme and maintaine against the *Novatians*, or whatsoever other heretickes; and therefore most injurious is my Adversarie, & other Papists, in charging us with the heresie of the *Novatians*, in that point. Howbeit, it is not an absolute, but a Ministeriall & limited power, and authoritie, which the Ministers of Christ have herein received. For, to forgive sinnes properly and absolutely, is a priviledge & prerogative proper unto God.

*Mich. 7. 18.*

*Esa. 43. 25.*

*Mar. 2. 7.*

*Luk. 5. 21.*

*Revel. 3. 7.*

*Greg. exposit. 2.*

*Psal. Panit.*

*Radulph. Ard.*

*homil. Dominus, 1.*

*post Pasch.*

*Proc. Lombard.*

*lib. 4. Sentent.*

*distinct. 18. E. F.*

*Optat. libr. 5.*

*Amb. de Spir.*

*Sand. lib. 3. c. 10.*

And therefore did Gregory the great, (Bishop of Rome,) say:

*Quis enim potest peccata dimittere, nisi solus Deus?* For who can forgive sinnes, but God alone? The power of releasing sins,

(saith also Radulphus Ardens,) belongeth to God alone. But the Ministerie, (which is also improperly called a power,) hee

hath granted to his substitutes, who after their manner, doe binde, and absolve, that is, doe declare that men are bound or absolved. For God doth first inwardly absolve the sinner, by

compunction: & then the Priest outwardly, by giving the sentence, doth declare, that he is absolved. Peter Lombard also,

Master of the Sentences, saith, That God alone doth forgive and retayne sinnes, and yet hath he given power of binding &

loosing unto his Church. But he bindeth and looseth one way, and the Church another. For, he onely by himselfe forgiveth

sinnes, who both clenseth the soule, from inward blot, & looseth it from the debt of everlasting death, & this he hath not granted unto Priests: to whom notwithstanding, he hath given the

power of binding and loosing, that is to say, of declaring men to be bound or loosed. *Est ergo in universis servientibus, non do-*

*minium, sed ministerium.* There is therefore, (saith Optatus,) in all the officers or servants, not a dominion, but a ministerie.

Behold, (saith S. Ambrose,) that, by the holy Ghost, sinnes are forgiven, & men, to the forgiveness of sinnes, bring but their

Ministerie: they exercise not any authoritie or power. The

power

power of forgiving sinnes, (saith S. Basil,) is not given to Christs Ministers absolutely: but upon the obedience of the penitent, & his consent with him, that hath the care of his soule. Yea, (saith S. Ambrose,) neyther Angell, nor Archangell, can, nor the Lord himselfe, when we have sinned, doth release us, unlesse we bring repentance with us. Christ his Ministers therefore doe not, nor ought to declare, or pronounce remission and forgiveness of sinnes to any, but to such, as Christ their Lord & Master, by the Tenor of his word, hath warrantd remission of sinnes unto. For if they doe otherwise, it is not ratified in heaven, which they doe upon earth. But all these three points, have I handled in my former Booke, where, as well as here, they appeare to be Apostolicall, and Orthodoxe truths, and not hereticall, or erroneous opinions. Now then let all equall men judge, how well and wisely, this *Quidam homo*, or *quoddam animal Anomolon*, & *Pseudonymon*, this Adversarie of mine, dealeth with me, whilst he termeth me, as he pleaseth, and resemblance me to a *Phripiers Prentice*, whose office is, (saith he, speaking like a man of skil in that arte, or occupation,) *to goe from one Corner unto another, searching old Ragges to line new clothes.* For I have borrowed, (saith he,) the shreds of my Religion from *Simon Magus*, the *Novatians*, and other hereticks. How much this man is deceaved, and mistaken, doth now, (I hope), more then sufficiently appeare, by that which is before spoken. Neyther indeed is it ours, but his, the Popish Religion, that is thus patched, and pieced of many and sundrie errors and heresies, being therein like a beggars cloake consisting of many ragges and shreds sowed together: as diverse Protestants, and amongst the rest, *Doctor Willet* in his *Tetrastylon Papiismi*, and that learned, and Reverend Bishop, *Doctor Morton*, in his *Catholicke Appeale* for the Protestants, being an Answer to *Brerely* the Priest, have

Basil. regul. Bre-  
utor. quest. 15.

Ambros. Epist.  
28 ad Theod.  
Imp.

have declared at large, and in the many and sundrie particulars thereof.

Notwithstanding therefore whatsoever mine Adversarie hath said, or can say to the contrarie, it is apparant, by the consanguinitie and agreement in Faith and doctrine, which our Church hath with the Apostolicall writings, that it was in the Apostles times, and by them approved. And this being the undoubted true Church, and builded upon that invincible and unruinable Rocke, Christ Iesus, against which the gates of Hell shall never prevaile: must it not needes be supposed to have also a continuance in all succeeding times and ages, even to the worlds end, notwithstanding that Poperie, or whatsoever other errors, or heresies did grow up with it, like Tares among the good Corne? Yea, that our Church, (that is, people beleeving and professing the Faith and Religion, that we doe,) was in the times, and ages succeeding the Apostles, even untill the dayes of the grand Antichrist, and during all the time also, even of the grand antichrist his raigne, is likewise declared in my former booke, not only, in this second Chapter of the first part, but chiefly and specially in the second Chapter of the second part of it: where I have set downe this Position, and proved it, that the Church is not so visible, as to be alwayes, & at all times openly seene & knowne to the wicked and persecuting world. And for prooffe hereof, I alledged S. *Augustine*, who therefore compareth the Church to the *Mone*, which is often obscured, and hid: yea he confesseth and teacheth, *That the Church may sometime be so hid, as that the verie members thereof shall not know one another.* It is true, that the men whereof the Church consisteth, are alwayes visible, and may be seene, as being men: but the Faith and Religion they beleeve and hold, is not so visible, as to be alwayes, seene, discovered, & known

*Aug. in Plal. 10.  
De Baptis. contr.  
Donatist. lib. 6.  
cap 4.*



to the wicked, and malignant world, although sometime it be, which point you may see there further declared. And therefore they be not *Chymicall arguments*, (as my Adversarie, in his *Chymericall and Alchymisticall Divinitie surmisseth*), but solide and sound proofes, that I bring to declare, that the true Church is sometimes visible, and to be seene of this wicked world, and sometimes invisible, and not to be seene of it, that is to say, it is sometimes a *Patent*, and sometimes a *Latent* Church: of which sort because the Papists, will not grant their Church to be, but will have it alwayes visible, & evermore splendidly appearing to the eyes of the world, it is a plaine, & demonstrative argument against them, that therefore theirs cannot be the true Church. I further shewed in this second Chapter, that the true Church, planted by the Apostles, was afterward by little, and little, and by degrees to grow corrupted, and to continue in those her errors, corruptions and deformities, for a long time, even till after the sixt Angell had begun to blow the Trumpet, according to the prediction & Prophecie thereof in the Revelation of *S. Iohn*: which Prophecie because it is found to agree with our Church, and that it cannot be made to agree with theirs, which they will not grant to be, capable of any corruption, or error: It there-upon also followeth, that not theirs, but ours, must needs be the true Church, planted by the Apostles. These arguments I here the rather mention, that my adversary might see, *That the blast of the sixt Angels trumpet, did not blow away all the arguments, which I should have brought for my purpose, as he scoffingly speaketh*, being not able otherwise, or in other then a scoffing sort, to answer them. For what better argument can there be to prove our Church, and to disprove & confute theirs, then this, that ours doth agree with the predictions & prophecies contrayned in the sacred

*Revel. 9. 11.*  
*Revel. 10. 1. 2.*  
*10. 11.*

and Canonick Scriptures, and theirs neyther doth, nor can be made to agree with them,

And here also falleth to the ground, that Paradoxe, and untrue opinion, which he holdeth, that one error in the Church, overthroweth the whole Church: making it to be no true Church, but onely an imaginarie Church. It is true, that S. Paul saith, *That a little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump of dough.* But hee doth not say, that, it utterly overthroweth, nullifieth, and extinguisht it; yea, even this Church of *Corinth*, wherein this leaven was, (by reason of that wicked incestuous man, permitted to remaine, unseperated, & unexcommunicated amongst them, to the endangering of others, by his example,) was neverthelesse the *Church of God*: and so doth S. Paul expressly call it, notwithstanding that error amongst them. Again in the same Church of *Corinth* there were also *Contentions* amongst them, and *envying*, and *strife*, and *divisions*, yea, *σχίσματα καὶ ἑρέσεις*, *schismata, & hereses*, *schismes, & heresies*: and yet was it a true Church of God, all these errors and faults notwithstanding, as S. Paul declareth. The Church of *Ephesus*, was likewise a true Church of God, & for sundrie things much commended: yet had God some thing against her, because she had left her first love, *Remember therefore*, (saith he,) *from whence thou art fallen, and repent, & doe the first workes, &c.* The Church of *Pergamus* was also a true Church of God: Yet I have, (saith God,) *a few things against thee, because thou hast there, them that maintaine the doctrine of Balaam, &c. And them that maintaine the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.* The Church of *Thiattyra*, was likewise a true Church of God; and for many things also, much commended: *Notwithstanding* (saith God) *I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest the woman Iseabell, which calleth her selfe a Prophetesse,*

1 Cor 5. 6.

1 Cor. 1. 2.

1 Cor. 15. 12.

1 Cor. 1. 11.

1 Cor. 3. 3.

1 Cor. 1. 13. 19.

1 Cor. 1. 13. 19.

Rev. 2. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Revela 2. 12. 13.

14. 15.

Rev. 2. 18. 19. 20.

pheteſſe, to teach and deceave my ſervants, &c. By all which, you ſee, that one error, or one fault in a Church, doth not therefore prove it to be no Church, or no true Church. Yea, it appeareth that a Church, and a true Church may bee, though divers defaults, and errors, bee in it, which bee not fundamentall. How much then doth mine Adverſarie abuſe that Text of S. James: where hee ſaith: *Qui deficit in uno, factus eſt omnium reus: Whoſoever* James. 2. 10. 11. ſhall keepe the whole law, and yet ſayle in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that ſaid, thou ſhalt not commit adulterie, ſaid alſo thou ſhalt not kill: now, though thou commit no adultery, yet if thou killeſt, thou art a tranſgreſſor of the law. For, what S. James meaneth by this, that he which faileth or offendeth in breaking though but one of Gods Commandements, is guilty of all: himſelfe here ſheweth, when he ſaith, that he is thereby become a tranſgreſſor of the law: and conſequently guiltie of the curſe inflicted, by the ſentence of the Law, upon every one that continueth not in all things, that are written in the booke of the Law to doe them. So that he is guiltie of all, not that he hath broken all the Commandements, by breaking only of one, nor that he which breaketh onely one, ſhall be puniſhed in hell, as much, and with as great a meaſure of torments, as hee that careleſſly breaketh them all, but that by this breaking, but of one Commandement, he hath offended the Maieſtie of the Law-giver, incurred his diſpleaſure, and made himſelfe as well lyable to the curſe of the law, that is, hath deſerved to ſuffer eternall tormētſ (though not in ſo great, & high a degree, and meaſure) as if he had broken them all. He therefore much wrongerth this Text, when he applyeth it to prove, that it cannot be a true Church, which hath any error in it, or that he that ſayles in one point of Religion, hath onely an imaginarie Religion, and no true Religion in him.

Galat. 3. 10.  
Deut. 27. 26.

*Iuseb. lib. 7. cap.  
5. in the greek,  
and cap. 3. lat.*

*1. John. 1. 8.*

*Ephes. 4. 3. 4. 5.*

What? was the Church wherein *S. Cyprian* lived, no true Church, or was *S. Cyprian* no true Christian, or had he no true Religion in him, because he held the error of *Rebaptization*? Or were none of those, true Churches, nor had any of them any true Religion in them, which held the *Chiliassticke error*, or error of the *Millenaries*? Or were *S. Augustine*, *S. Ierome*, or any of the rest of the ancient Fathers therefore no true Christians, or had they onely an imaginarie, and no true Religion in them, because of some error they held? Yea, he may aswell conclude out of this Text, (if he make no care, nor conscience, to abuse it,) that everie one whosoever that erreth & fayleth in any point, eyther of doctrine, or manners, or that sinneth in any sort, by breaking any one of Gods Commandements, is onely an imaginarie and no true Christian at all: Whereupon would follow this grosse absurditie, and untruth, that there were then no true Christians at all in the whole world, because there be none but have some sinne, or other, in them. It is true, that there is but *one* true Faith, and right Religion, and that we should all endeavour to observe and keepe it, as likewise we ought all to endeavour, so much as is possible, to keepe all & everie one of Gods Cōmandements: but if by reason of the frayltie, and imperfection, that is in all men, any Church doe erre in some one thing; or any man doe erre, sinne, or offend, in some one point, you see by the premisses, that no such inference can be made, that therefore it is no true Church, or therefore he is no true Christian, or hath no good, nor true Religion in him, because of that one sinne, or error committed. All which neverthelesse I speake not, to justifie, or defend any errors, in any Church, or any sinne, transgression, or fault in any person, nor yet as though he could justly taxe our true Christian Church with any error in Faith, or doctrine:



strine: but onely to shew him his owne error, and the fault of his owne idle, & brainesicke opinion. Whereunto also may be adjoynd another Paradoxe or strange opinion of his, and not onely his, for it is the opinion also of the Rhemists, and other Papists, where they hold, that the blasphemie, or sinne against the holy Ghost, is remissible, & may be forgiven: which is directly, and cleane contrarie to the expresse words of Christ Iesus himselfe, declaring that the sinne against the Father, and the Sonne, is remissible, and may be forgiven: *But the sinne against the holy Ghost, (saith he), shall not be forgiven, neyther in this world, nor in the world to come.* And S. Marke relateth it thus, *That he which committeth that sinne, shall never have forgiveness, but is culpable of eternall damnation.* Now then, let all men judge, whether of these, we should beleeve? namely, whether Christ, or the Papists, in this case? Lastly, he falleth into a consideration, what sinne it is, that I committed, in making and setting forth my Booke; & distinguishing sinne into three sorts, (*viz.*) some of *Frailtie*, some of *Ignorance*, & some of *Malice*: he freeth me of that of *frailty*, and of that of *malice*, and therefore concludeth, that it was a sinne of *ignorance*. Thus out of his *ignorance*, (for I hope there is no malice in him,) he argueth *ex non concessu*. For how doth hee prove it to be any sinne at all, to penne such a Booke, and to set it forth? *Ipsē dixit*, is all his prooffe. What? Is it a sinne to speake or write, in defence of Gods truth & religion? Yea, is it not (cleane contrariewise) a sinne, and a very great, & most fearefull sin for my Adversary, to write (as he doth) against God, his truth, & religion, & against his Church, & people, & against the King also in the point of his Supremacie, & against the Lawes, & Statutes of the Realme also, (which establish those two points, for which I write and speake), and all for defence of the whore of Babylon, & of

Mark. 12. 31. 32

Luk. 12. 10

Mark. 3. 28 29.

that man of sinne, the grand Antichrist? Is not this a sinne  
meete for him to repent of? This his great sinne therefore,  
& all other wicked workes, & wayes of blind Poperie, I  
would wish him to forsake in time, & to become & walke  
*As one of the children of light*: which if he desire to doe, (as  
I trust he doth,) he must then with the *Psalmist*, make not  
his owne, or other mens pleasures, but Gods will, & word  
to be the *Lanterne unto his feete, and the light unto his path*,  
& thereby must he be directed, both for points of doctrine  
& for life & conversation also. *For if any doe not, or speake  
not according to this word, it is because*, (as the Scriptures  
teach) *they have not that light in the, which they should have*.  
It is true, which he saith, *That Christ, the supreme Iudge of  
Heaven, & Earth, will most certainly come to judgement, and  
will Iudge most justly*. But it were good he would remember  
withall how, & by what rule, he will Iudge? namely, that  
he will Iudge according to his owne word, & Gospell. For,  
according to that his Word, & Gospell, it is, that hee will  
Iudge us all, in the last day, as himselfe, & his true & faith-  
full Apostle *S. Paul*, doe both assure us.

In the meane time then, can there be any better course  
taken, or any better wisdom shewed, then for both him,  
& me, & for us al, humbly & willingly to submitte our sel-  
ves, our lives & conversations, & all our positions, & opi-  
nions, to be controlled, reformed, over-ruled, & Iudged by  
that word & Gospell, according whereunto, we shall all be  
Iudged in that last day? This grace, & wisdom therefore  
God of his mercie grant unto us all, (if it be his will,) to his  
honour and glorie, and to our owne everlasting com-  
forts, through Iesus Christ, our whole and  
only Mediator, Saviour, and Re-  
deemer. Amen.

F I N I S.

## Post scriptum.

**L**Et none hereafter expect any more from mee, touching these matters, untill my former Booke (which by this my Adversarie is promised to be answered, according to the three conditions required by me), be first, accordingly, answered: and that this Reply, be also therewithall Answered; and all this to be done in Print, and not in Manuscripts, & with the Answerers right, and true name also thereunto subscribed.

### ERRATA, CORRECTA.

**I**N the Epistle Dedicat, pag. 1. line 12. this word (first) blotte out. In the Epist. to the Reader, pag. 1. l. 23. for satisfactory, satisfactorily, p. 8. l. 5. for suffertus, suffenus, p. 9. lin 33. for scripturiam, scripturam, p. 10. l. 14. for ingeniously, ingenuously. In the first Chapter of the Booke, p. 2. l. 5. for will, soule. p. 13. 23. this word secondly, blotte out, & in stead thereof put this figure 2. to note it to be the second section of that Chapter, & so read on forward, thus: It being then a thing very demonstratively evident, &c. p. 13. l. 32. for Ministers, Ministry, p. 15. l. 6. for writeth, citeth, p. 17. l. 6. for makeinde, mankind p. 24. in the margent, for 2. *Saw*. 20. 17. put 2. *Saw*. 20. 26. In p. 24. l. 31. & 32. read it thus: *Aaron and his sonnes were appointed to the office of priesthood* p. 26. l. 31. this word Thirdly, blotte out, & in lieu thereof put the figure of 3. to note it to be the third section of that Chap. p. 26. l. 33. for wisheth, wished. p. 34. l. 10. for young, young, p. 38. l. 12. for divert, direct p. 39. l. 19. read, as unto the chiefe p. 42. l. 6. & 7. for Iohn 9, 11, Iohn 19, 11. p. 44. l. 17. for yea, yet, p. 44. l. 18. for construed, considered, p. 45. l. 26. for advancement, advantage, p. 51. l. 23. for ingeniously, ingenuously, p. 52. l. 10. for Aquinus, Aquinas, p. 52. 32. for cause, clause, p. 13. l. 19. betweene, as, and other Bishops, put this word, over, pag. 38. l. 16. for worth, worthy, p. 40. l. 5. for *inuenio*, read *inuenio*, p. 43. l. 33. this word (as) blotte out, p. 57. l. 3. this word (and) blotte out, p. 66. l. 2. for shall, should, p. 70. l. 24. for States, seates, p. 79. l. 24. for under, made, p. 82. l. 18. for how, now, p. 83. l. 7. for Episcopos, Episcopos, p. 84. l. 12. after, but, read by, pag. 11. against l. 24. in the margent, for Novel, const, 123. Novel, const, 133, p. 19. l. 22. for hignesse, highnesse, pag. 100. l. 11. for proferant, vel Apo, pag. 88. l. 26. for *Airam Hiram*, & in margine, for 1. *Saw*, 5. 1. read 2. *Saw*, 5. 11. p. 88. l. 8. for use, used, p. 94. l. 3. for could, would, p. 98. l. 19. betweene nevertheless, & admit, put this word (to) p. 97. l. 16. for one, on, p. 97. ly, the first (onely) blotte out, pag. 93. l. 9. for grant, read, perceive, p. 102. l. 22. after their, read dayes, p. 102. l. 11. for make, made p. 82. l. 11. for Bithinijs, Bithiniae.

And if any other faults have escaped in the Printing, I desire the Reader to correct them with his pen.